India

FOR THE

No. 9. New Series.
No. 103. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 1898.

Registered as a Newspaper. | Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 129
Of the So-called Poverty of India... 132
The Strange Case of Sir F. Roberts 132
The Logic of Indian Deficit, by S. H. Swinny 134
"From Tonkin to India"... 135
Warfare beyond the Frontier 136
The Week in Parliament 136
Chronicle of the Week 137
The New Law of Sedition: Report of the Select Committee 138
India in Parliament 140
Et Caetera 143
Advertisements 144

NOTES AND NEWS.

THE conspicuous part which Lord George Hamilton and the Earl of Onslow—the Secretary and the Under-Secretary for India—have taken in the movement to wreck the London County Council is not devoid of a significance of its own. We called attention to the matter some time ago in these columns, and we are glad to see that Lord Rosebery, in his great speech at the St. James's Hall last Tuesday night, drove the point vigorously home:

> There has been put in my hands (said Lord Rosebery) a circular dated from the India Office—(laughter)—signed by one of the responsible Ministers of that office, inviting each of the Conservative members of London, and the Conservative members of London are 87 per cent. of the whole—inviting each of them to write, on his own private note paper—(laughter)—there is a delicate difference here between the India Office and the Parliamentary members, which I will not attempt to explain—inviting each member to influence any prominent person he knows to vote—not for the "Moderate" but for the "Unionist" candidate. (Laughter.) I, in my youth and innocence, was under the impression that the India Office had had its hands pretty full of late. (Loud laughter and cheers.) I did not contemplate to the full extent all its eagerness, and its ambition. I did not understand that it was anxious to add to the occupation of Chitral the administration of London. (Cheers.) But in all solemnity and seriousness, I think the India Office would be better employed in India, in looking after the 200 millions of people committed to its charge, and leave the five millions of London to look after themselves.

Lord G. Hamilton's and Lord Onslow's neglect of their proper—and by no means un-remunerative—duties is bad enough. But there is another aspect of their conduct which ought to make liberal-minded men in London and elsewhere reflect—we mean the reflex influence of repressive policy in India upon British politics at home. Sooner or later the British public will come to perceive that if it is to govern India with the machinery of despotism, and establish at home a class of bureaucrats and ex-bureaucrats imbued with Russian ideas, it must smart for its folly. What makes the present attack of the heads of the India Office upon the County Council peculiarly significant is the fact that at this very moment the municipalities in India are being made to feel with special severity the twist of the reactionary screw.

It looks as if a regular crusade against municipal self-government had been started in the great towns of India. In Calcutta, as we are now informed by telegram, and as the *Bengali* stated some time ago, it is intended to interpose a body of twelve men, with almost irresponsible executive powers, between the Chairman and the Municipal Commissioners. These twelve men are to be elected in equal proportions by the Government, the European merchants, and the residents respectively, so that the taxpayers of Calcutta will have the privilege of electing only one-third of the members of the powerful executive body. In other words, the resident taxpayers of Calcutta are to be ruled by a body of men appointed mainly by the Government and the European merchants. Similarly in Madras the new Municipal Bill creates the post of Municipal Secretary, and it seems clear from Sir Henry Bliss's reply to a question put in Council that the Municipal Council will henceforth be kept in leading strings by the Municipal Secretary. Again, in Bombay, the Bombay Improvement Bill proposes the creation of a separate body of trustees, with power to incur expenditure for improvements, and to draw money from the Accountant-General, who will recoup himself from the municipal funds.

The assumption underlying these retrogressive changes is that a bureaucracy is more efficient than an elected body of Commissioners, managing their own affairs. The assumption is unfounded and erroneous whether in India or in London. The improvements which the elected Commissioners have effected in Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, as compared with the work of their predecessors, the nominated "Justices," is admitted to be remarkably good. Roads and drains have been improved, good drinking water has been supplied, immense sums have been spent on sanitary measures, and if there has been dishonesty and peculation, it has been exposed. We know of course that there is need for further sanitary improvements, especially in view of the plague. The elected Commissioners were willing and eager to undertake such improvements on receiving some professional help from the Government. But in an evil hour the Government has chosen virtually to discard their services, to treat them with contumely, and to transfer all real executive power to other bodies. How can government on these illiberal lines be successful or popular in India?

In this connexion we may add that, as we go to press, a telegram reaches us from our Madras correspondent as follows:—"Replying to an address at Rajahmundry [in the Godavari district of Madras] the Governor has endorsed the Government of India's encomiums upon the efficient working of the municipalities in the Madras Presidency." As in London so in India, it would seem—popular municipal authorities are to be hamstrung not because they do their work badly, but because they do it well. Can it be that the London Municipal Society, which Lord G. Hamilton and the Earl of Onslow adorn, has an affiliated branch in India? Or is it that the London Municipal Society is itself a branch from the parent stem nourished in the congenial atmosphere of Anglo-Indian bureaucracy?

The *Bengali* gives the following further particulars of the proposed Municipal Act for Calcutta:—

> The General Committee, akin to the Standing Committee of the Bombay Corporation, will be the governing body. Of the twelve members of the General Committee, only four will be nominated by the elected Commissioners; of the other eight, four will be appointed by the Government, who will consist chiefly of officials with a sprinkling of the Mahometan element. These gentlemen will understand nothing of the work of the Corporation, and will be mere ciphers. Of the other four, two will be nominated by the Chamber of Commerce, one by the Trades' Association, and one by the Port Trust.

If these particulars are accurate, the system of representation which was introduced in Calcutta more than twenty years ago, and which has done much to improve the town, will become a farce. Calcutta will be handed over to an irresponsible bureaucracy. We must all hope that this calamity may yet be averted.

The Anglo-Indian Press continues its hostile criticism of the repressive proposals—some of which have now become the repressive legislation—of the Government of India. For example, the most recent issue of the Calcutta *Englishman* to hand says, in an article upon the Indian Penal Code Amendment Bill:—

> The Select Committee appears to have been travelling in a circle during the five weeks in which it has been at work on the Bill, and has brought us out exactly where we were when the Bill was submitted to the Council for the first time. If the Bill is passed as it has left the Committee the result will be exactly what it would have been if it had been approved of at the first reading. The Government has certainly shown a desire to conciliate public opinion, if we may judge from Mr. Chalmers's apologia; but in this as in other cases the performance has fallen short of the intention. No report has yet been presented by the Committee on the Bill to amend the Criminal Procedure Code—a Bill which, it will be remembered, endows individual executive officers of Government with a penal and judicial prerogative of a highly dangerous kind. The objections raised to the proposed amendments in the law of Criminal procedure have been

even more strenuously voiced than the opposition to the new Sections 124A and 505 of the Penal Code. It remains to be seen whether the Government will give way on these points.

"If the Bill is passed as it has left the Committee, the result will be exactly what it would have been if it had been approved at the first reading." Precisely. And, as will be seen from the account of the new Act which we print on another page, this is substantially what has taken place. Lord George Hamilton will incur a terrible responsibility if he permits this measure, and the rest of the odious series, to stand.

We referred at some length last week to the boomerang observations of the Calcutta correspondent of the *Times* upon our correspondent's account of the great anti-coercion meeting in Calcutta. On Friday last, after INDIA had gone to press, we received the following telegram from our correspondent in reply to the *Times*:—

The meeting was no fiasco. The newspapers here report the large gathering in the Town Hall. The doors were closed for fear of collapse and large numbers were turned away in consequence. Many public bodies in the interior expressed their sympathy with the objects of the meeting or sent delegates. There were some students in the side gallery, but the rest of the audience were substantial men with a stake in the country. The audience numbered over 4,000 persons.

And yet, until after the publication of our telegram, the correspondent of the *Times* had not thought fit even to mention the fact that a meeting had been held. "Tactics such as these"—but our readers no doubt remember the phrase.

Our Madras correspondent telegraphed on Wednesday (March 2): "Commenting on the new Sedition Act, the *Madras Times* says that Mr. Chalmers has hammered a nail into the coffin of British empire in India." The *Madras Times*, it may be added, is an Anglo-Indian journal, edited by an Englishman.

The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* supplies a useful list of public bodies, European and Indian, which protested against the new Sedition Law of India. The list does not profess to be exhaustive, but so far as it goes it shows how widespread and influential was the public opinion arrayed against the Bill, and how defiantly the Government has acted in passing the Bill into law. Here is the list furnished by the *Patrika*:—(1) British Indian Association; (2) European and Anglo-Indian Defence Association; (3) Mahajana Sabha, Madras; (4) Conference of Representative Men in Calcutta; (5) Inhabitants of Madras; (6) Bombay Presidency Association; (7) Bar Library, Calcutta; (8) Bengal Chamber of Commerce; (9) Indian Relief Society; (10) Inhabitants of Krishnuggur; (11) Vakeels' Association, Calcutta; (12) Inhabitants of Burrisal; (13) Faridpur People's Association; (14) Pleaders' Association, Bombay; (15) Poona Sarvajanik Sabha; (16) Nagpur Malguzars; (17) Bombay Public Meeting; (18) Triplicane Literary Society; (19) Purulia Bar Association; (20) Chittagong Association; (21) Rajshahi Association; (22) Barangore Ratepayers' Association; (23) Tipperah Bar Association; (24) Bar Library, Dacca; (25) Mymensing Association; (26) Ahmedabad Legal Practitioners' Association; (27) Bhagulpur Bar Association; (28) Gya Bar Association; (29) Inhabitants of Serampur; (30) Indian Association. Lord G. Hamilton seems so far to resemble Mr. Balfour that he does not read the newspapers.

British journals of all opinions (and of none) are lamenting copiously the fate of M. Zola and Captain Dreyfus. We agree. But let not "unctuous rectitude" conceal the facts (*a*) that Dreyfus had at least the semblance of a trial, while the brothers Natu have had none; and (*b*) that if M. Zola is imprisoned for defaming a tribunal, Mr. Tilak is imprisoned for hurting the susceptibilities of Anglo-India.

Rumour has been busy of late with the probable successor of Lord Elgin in the Viceroyalty of India. Lord George Hamilton, Lord Harris, and many others have, in turn, been mentioned, and now the gossips point to Lord Balfour of Burleigh. It is, of course, a misfortune that it should fall to the lot of the present Government to appoint a Viceroy; but competent observers express the view that, of all the men whom Lord Salisbury would be at all likely to select, Lord Balfour of Burleigh is the best. He is certainly a level-headed and industrious man, and, what is very much to the point, a good "man of business." People who profess to know something of the inner workings of the political machine regard Lord Balfour's appointment as not improbable. For ourselves, we should like to see Mr. Morley or Mr. Bryce Viceroy of India.

From enquiries made by our representative at the India Office, it seems clear that the new Army proposals of the Home Government will cost India a pretty penny. It is not at present easy to arrive at exact details of the extent to which Indian Finance will be affected. But we shall probably not be far wrong in assuming that the pay of the British soldier in India will be affected in the same way in which the pay of the British soldier at home is affected. The Government proposals may be thus stated in terms of gain or loss to the private soldier:—

Gain.				
Grocery Ration allowance 3d. a day =	£4	10	0	a year
Gratuity in lieu of deferred pay.. ..	1	0	0	,,
	£5	10	0	,,
Loss.				
Abolition of deferred pay at 2d. a day =	3	0	0	,,
,, ,, net gain to soldier	£2	10	0	,,

As no men serving in India will fall under any of the exceptions provided in the case of three-year men, etc., practically one may multiply this sum of £2 10s. 0d. by the number of non-commissioned officers and men on the Indian establishment, *i.e.*, roughly 70,000. This gives us a total of £175,000, which, at a rate of 16 rupees to the £ (Re. = 1s. 3d.)—for the British troops are paid on a sterling basis—means an addition of no less than Rx. 280,000 to the cost of the Indian Army.

This is, we think, what may be called a very conservative estimate. Sir Charles Dilke—who is notoriously accurate as to matters of fact—stated the other night in the House of Commons that the ultimate cost to India would be not far short of Rx. 400,000. As the European troops of the Indian Army are the most expensive in the world, and the Indian Government usually contrives to improve upon any piece of extravagance which is in the air, the latter figure is no doubt quite as likely as the former. But no matter which of these sums should ultimately prove the measure of the Indian Government's payments under the new Army proposals, is it not significant of the haphazard and irresponsible way in which India is governed that these proposals should have already been finally discussed in the House of Commons, while not a word is heard from the head of the Indian Government as to their effect upon Indian Finance? The Indian taxpayers have no voice either directly or indirectly through their local institutions in the incurring of this expenditure, and the man who is supposed to watch over India's interests sits by in silence apparently unconscious, until awakened by some inconvenient questioner, that the Army "reforms" spell new burdens for impoverished India.

The short Return which has just been issued of salaries paid in India to British Residents at Native Courts and the like is a rather odd document. One does not know what caused Major Jameson, M.P., to move for it, but perhaps he may not be puzzled by the figures. Fifty-five cases are enumerated, and salaries are specified ranging from 4,000 rupees at Indore to 500 rupees at Kalat. The period, whether year or month or week, for which these sums are paid is not specified, but presumably they are the monthly pay. If so, one gets a glimpse of the scale of pay on which Indian administration is conducted. For instance, the 4,000 rupees paid to the Resident at Hyderabad, at 1s. 4d. per rupee, is about £3,200 per annum. The Chief Engineer of Irrigation at Hyderabad, at 1,500 rupees, receives about £1,200. The Inspector-General of Revenue at 2,000 rupees receives £1,600. The Comptroller-General receives the same amount, the Inspector-General of Police receives about £1,200 to £1,350, and the Chief Engineer of the Hyderabad-Godavari Railway, at 2,000 rupees, receives also about £1,600. Officers holding similar appointments in other parts of India are paid on the same liberal scale. After the remarkable

statement as to the financial prospects of India made by Lord G. Hamilton last week, these figures become highly interesting. If the India Civil Service has its drawbacks there are also decided pecuniary compensations. It should not be hard to keep body and soul together on the pay of a British Resident.

Lord Kimberley seems to have sounded a somewhat uncertain note, in his speech at Oxford last Saturday, with reference to Indian frontier policy. The Liberal party, he said, is adverse to a "forward" military policy. But, he added, "they must not allow themselves to confound the general question of a forward military policy in India with particular instances where our forces have stepped beyond the frontier." In plain English, we suppose, what is sauce for Chitral is not sauce for Waziristan. "The whole question," Lord Kimberley continued, "was, What was the real intention and object of this forward movement? Did it represent a military policy which aimed at subjugating all the tribes, shifting the common frontier to Afghanistan, and moving forward to Kandahar and Kabul, or did it mean that it was to a considerable extent to be something which might be called a 'police measure'?" And again: "There might be circumstances where we might be forced to go forward, through the action of others entirely independent of us; we should on no account go in advance if that policy meant a continual advance in times of peace, and when there was no immediate issue to be met." There is in all this, it seems to us, a dangerous amount of concession to the Simla clique. For it is so perilously easy for soldiers to justify each particular forward movement on the ground that it is a "measure of police," or that there is an "immediate issue to be met." Surely, the real question is whether India shall continue to throw away the enormous advantages of her natural triple frontier of river, desert, and mountain, and what is wanted in dealing with the "forward" school is a "bag and baggage" policy. But Lord Kimberley, if he has been accurately reported, does not appear to think so.

It is announced that the Indian Budget will be introduced on March 21, and that, in accordance with the usual procedure, a week will be allowed for the consideration of Sir J. Westland's statement before the discussion takes place.

The Hon. Gangadhar Rao Madhav Chetnavis recently asked in the Viceroy's Council, whether in view of the late acute famine in the Central Provinces, the Government would suspend for a time the realisation of the enhanced rental fixed by the new settlement which has just been completed. The Hon. Mr. Rivaz replied that the Government "do not consider it necessary to postpone the introduction of the revised assessments." This attitude is deplorable. On the one hand we see the undoubted poverty of the cultivating classes in India, proved by recurring and disastrous famines; on the other hand the unutterable determination of the Government to screw up rents which must leave the agriculturist in perpetual poverty and indebtedness.

It is apprehended that the plague will spread in the Punjab beyond the area at present affected. The Government of the Punjab has accordingly published a memorandum calling the attention of the people to the steps which it will be necessary to take: (1) the evacuation or isolation of the affected area; (2) the establishment of camps for the inhabitants; (3) the disinfection of property; (4) the treatment of the sick in an isolation camp; and (5) the regulation of the return of the inhabitants to the evacuated area. The Government looks for help from public-spirited citizens on behalf of such poor people as cannot support themselves in the segregation camps. The *Tribune* of Lahore, commenting on this Memorandum, says:

> We fail to understand why there is no mention in the Memorandum of these inspection—or let us call them "search"—parties? Knowing as we do how much worry and popular dissatisfaction such visits have given rise to in some parts of the country, most explicit directions are needed as to the constitution of the inspecting bodies—that is, what is to be the number of Natives and their status in them, the extent of their powers and so forth. It is impossible practically—unless the people be made to camp out anyhow—to evacuate such populous cities as Lahore and Amritsar. The system of visiting the dwellings to take away the sick to the hospital and destroy or disinfect articles exposed to infection must needs be adopted if the outbreak reaches the dimensions of those of the worst stricken Bombay towns. And it is necessary that the details of the system should be worked out beforehand.

Is there anything unreasonable in the suggestion?

There are some sensible remarks in *Finance* upon the cost of the "forward" policy beyond the North-West frontier:—

> One of the lessons of Mr. Hardy's "Tess" was that the woman pays, and that man would always act more or less wrongly and selfishly where woman was concerned till the man had to pay too. Now for our policy of expansion it is India that pays. Till Great Britain has to pay also, Indian policy will be reckless of financial considerations, if of no others. We shall be told—we have been told—that the recent abortive operations were undertaken in defence of India. Possibly; although there is a strange difference of opinion as to the desirability of defending India in this particular way. But why should India be cruelly taxed to be defended against Russia? We have conquered India, and we hold it for our own ends. Incidentally, we hope that India has reason to be grateful for coming under our rule, and we do our best according to our lights to make that rule beneficent to India. It is we, however, who are most interested in guarding what we have won against Russia or any other Power, and it is we who should pay. The economic and financial conditions of India are alike serious. It is wickedness, and worse, it is folly, to tax that poverty-stricken dependency in pursuance of a policy of expansion in Central Asia, whatever be the motives of that policy. If we lose India, it will be through reckless finance rather than from any other likely cause.

Which is an excellent argument for charging to the British Exchequer a fixed annual proportion of the military expenditure of the Government of India.

We add a sentence or two from a Madras correspondent on the frontier war:—

> As to the frontier campaign, it is the laughing-stock of India and Anglo-India as well, and none are more incensed than the British officers, who do not mince matters. See this week's *Madras Mail* for an article on Sir George White, and imagine what things have come to when such an article could be written.

The *Mail*, we see, plainly charges the Commander-in-Chief with "blundering, meddlesomeness, and incapacity" in the Chitral campaign; with having selected the Generals for the whole frontier war on the principle of favouritism; with having "completed the destruction of the finest Staff Department that any army possessed"; and with having "acted the part of a rival rather than that of a comrade" towards Sir William Lockhart. And this the *Mail* is constrained, on public grounds, to urge, while frankly admiring Sir George's conspicuous personal gallantry, and acknowledging that "it goes against the grain to have to find fault with this hero." All this is very significant indeed. And the *Madras Mail* is not yet suppressed.

Commenting on Mr. Samuel Smith's motion in favour of a British contribution to the war beyond the frontier, the *Manchester Guardian* said: "Some confusion of ideas was manifest in several of the speeches in the House of Commons on Mr. Smith's motion that this country should pay part of the expenditure on the recent frontier operations. There was a disposition to treat the motion as though it were proposing a charitable subscription to India. It proposed nothing of the kind. The real question is whether the expenditure on the North-West frontier was incurred on Imperial or on purely Indian grounds. Is the garrison at Chitral, for example, really a post for the defence of India, or is it not rather a pawn brought up in the course of that general diplomatic game with Russia which goes on quite independently of India's interests? If the latter, the expense ought, by agreement, to fall not on India but on ourselves; for, as Mr. Souttar reminded the House, there is a definite promise in the statute of 1858 that India should not be dragged into any question of Imperial policy. It is in fact a question not of generosity but of justice. Lord George Hamilton insisted on the fact that the Indian Government did not wish for assistance. Of course it does not. The prodigal will exhaust every expedient before he will so far pocket his pride as to return to his father. But we wish we could share the Indian Government's hope that no extra taxation will be necessary to meet expenditure so extraordinary as that of last year."

OF THE SO-CALLED POVERTY OF INDIA.

LORD G. HAMILTON, in his reply to Mr. Samuel Smith's motion in the House of Commons on February 22, made one of those speeches for which he has now become notorious. It would be difficult to name a more incompetent Minister in modern times, and that to his weak hands should be committed in these difficult days the destinies of our Indian Empire is nothing short of a national calamity. He appears to have made three points, so to speak; (1) India is not so poor as you think —besides, taxation is light; (2) the deficit on the year's financial operations is not so bad as it might be—it is only a matter of a little over six millions and a half; (3) in any case doles are bad. To which of these points to give the palm for fatuity one is in doubt. But let us examine each in turn.

(1) India is so little taxed. Now, it is typical of the kind of intellect which Lord George Hamilton boasts that the more definite and ascertainable the fact which he wishes to adduce, the more readily and grievously he blunders. He seems to have an unerring instinct for saying with some approach to precision the reverse of that which in figures especially he seems to be incapable of handling aright. Speaking of India's poverty, he said: "It must be borne in mind that although the mass of the people are poor they are very lightly taxed. I think they contribute less in table of comparison with any large population living under anything like a civilised Government." Now, a statement of this kind is either silly or wilfully unfair. Mr. Davitt interjected, "In what proportion to income?"—upon the answer to which query entirely depended any slight value that might attach to the Indian Secretary's remark. But this Philistine point of view, it seems, had never crossed Lord George Hamilton's mind—the possibility that a small contribution from a small income might involve a proportionately heavier sacrifice than a far larger contribution from a larger income had never occurred to the head of the Government of India. One need not think that he was wilfully unfair, though one cannot forget his quibbling over the opening of the Famine Relief Fund at the Mansion House. Let us see what the contrast really is, taking the year 1895-6 as our standard.

ENGLAND.	
Population (say)	40,000,000
Revenue from taxes	£85,000,000
Taxation per head	£2¼
Average private income per head of population (various estimates)	£40
Taxation to income, as	9 : 160
Proportion of income taken by taxes	5·6 *per cent.*
INDIA.	
Population (say)	230,000,000
Revenue from taxes and land	Rs. 660,000,000
Deduct land revenue	,, 260,000,000
Amount raised by taxes	Rs. 400,000,000
Taxation per head (say)	Rs. 1¾
Average private income per head of population (Lord Cromer's estimate)	Rs. 27
Taxation to income as	7 : 108
Proportion of income taken by taxes	6·5 *per cent.*

One sees then that in relation to the English taxpayer, the Indian taxpayer, if one reckons in units of only from 1-10th to 1-16th of the value (*i.e.*, in rupees as against pounds), has actually fewer such units in the proportion of 27 to 40, but pays nevertheless nearly as many units to the tax-collector. Here is the plain fact upon estimates which are not usually disputed by anybody, and conceding Lord George Hamilton's claim—doubtful as it is—to exclude the land revenue—the fact, namely, that while the English taxpayer, the richest in the world, contributes to taxation only 5·6 *per cent.* of his private income, the Indian taxpayer, the poorest in the world, contributes to taxation 6·5 *per cent.* of his. The one is making the sacrifice out of an average income of £40, and the other out of an average income of 27 rupees. And yet Lord George Hamilton "thinks" that the Indian people "contribute less in table of comparison with any large population living under anything like a civilised Government."

But (2) the deficit is not so bad. Really! So that the Secretary of State for India has the assurance to stand up in the House of Commons and tell the world that a deficit which he estimates at over six and a half tens of millions of rupees offers an occasion for congratulation on the ground that it is no worse. What, one wonders, would the British public have to say to a Chancellor of the Exchequer who talked in this light and airy fashion about a deficit of six and a half million pounds (for that is practically the equivalent for England) in our national accounts for one year? Let it be noted also that four out of the six and a half millions of deficit are due to needless oppression beyond the frontier; that this deficit follows hard on the heels of another of two millions; and then let one imagine what would in similar circumstances be the fate of a Ministry in England which should go about rubbing its hands in childish glee and talking about the piping times of peace and of financial equilibrium that were to come—resort being had in the meantime to a little loan. Let us try to appreciate the real meaning of this thing. The transaction seems to have been something like this:—

British Government (telegraphing to India): How are you off for money?

Indian Government (telegraphing back): Oh, nicely, thank you; only six and a half millions short—a mere trifle. We needn't trouble you.

British Government (evidently relieved—in reply): Delighted to hear you are doing so well. Deficit, six and a half millions, you say? Of course, a little thing like that is nothing to worry about. Now, if it had been anything in billions, you know, we should have been only too happy to oblige.

Chancellor of the Exchequer (to himself): Well, of all the wonders in the world—these Indian officials!—six and a half millions on the wrong side! Why, it would have been more than my place was worth over here. Nice soft thing they have over there. The whole thing is almost inconceivable. It makes one giddy to think of it. A deficit of six and a half millions; and to throw away money to be had for the asking! In all of which it is the Indian taxpayer who suffers.

Still (3), in any case doles are bad. This is the climax. This puts the coping-stone to as burlesque a political deliverance as was ever made by a Minister outside comic opera. That a member of a Government, the most doliferous of modern times, should have the hardihood to put forward such a plea is a thing imagination boggles at. Doles are bad, are they? Unsound finance? A dangerous political expedient? And so on. Did any gentleman say Landlords' Relief Act? And who is that talking about Voluntary schools? Irish landlords? Well, what of them? and West India sugar planters? Why, just see what this Government has already given or promised in doles:—

To Landlords	£2,000,000
,, Parsons	620,000
,, Sugar Planters	700,000
,, Irish Landlords	700,000
	£4,020,000

And then to talk about doles as evil! Truly an amazing performance—and a humiliating one. It does not conduce to the dignity of any system of Government that men like Lord George Hamilton should be at the head of important departments. Why did he not boldly grasp the nettle and say that he, and those whom he alternately instigates and applauds, dare not face the music of that Parliamentary inquisitiveness which a grant in aid to India would bring in its train?

THE STRANGE CASE OF SIR F. ROBERTS.

LORD ROBERTS OF KANDAHAR, as we announced last week, proposes to call attention on Monday next in the House of Lords, to "the papers recently presented to Parliament relating to British relations with the neighbouring tribes on the North-West frontier of India and the military operations undertaken against them during the year 1897-98." The announcement is a piquant one, when one remembers his lordship's experiences of twenty years ago and the part he has taken in the recent policy of aggression beyond the frontier. How

will Lord Roberts reconcile himself with Major-General Sir Frederick Roberts? It is hardly a secret that Lord Roberts has been chief military adviser of her Majesty's Ministers in their recent trans-frontier proceedings from Chitral downwards. He is also responsible for the outgoing fire-eater of a Commander-in-Chief, whose administrative conduct was lashed with such vigour the other week by the *Madras Mail*. Lord Roberts is, of course, an excellent man of war. But it does not follow that he is any safer an adviser on questions of policy than Sir George White. His trans-frontier experience must count for something. He went to the conquest of Afghanistan some twenty years ago with an ardent faith that the power of Kabul was too strong and must be broken down. He had no confidence in a strong, friendly and independent Afghanistan. So, *con amore*, he smashed up the Kabul powers, and then bethought him of the future. But the future policy which he sketched from his quarters at Kabul indicated that Lord Lawrence's principles, though discarded and trampled on, nevertheless gave him some mental uneasiness.

On May 12, 1880, Sir Frederick—shall we say the late Sir Frederick?—Roberts drew up a Memorandum which he forwarded to the Government of India on May 29. In a "Note" thereon, dated July 21, Sir R. E. Egerton, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, remarked, pertinently enough: "There is one thing which is apparent in the Memorandum of General Roberts, and that is the desire to move the army out of Afghanistan as quickly as possible." It will be interesting to see on Monday whether Lord Roberts still remembers how he felt when he was besieged in the Sherpur cantonment in December, 1879, when Kabul and the Bala Hissar were burnt and plundered under his eyes, in despite of him and of the Government of India, and when he escaped annihilation only through the incompetent generalship of the enemy. The experiences of the British forces during the expedition were suppressed or misrepresented at home. When they were in a measure revealed in books written by men who had taken part in the operations, the time had gone by for effective popular intervention, even if such books could have brought home the facts to the mass of the British electorate. But Lord Roberts may be expected to give due weight to his own disasters and narrow escapes from disaster, as well as to the futility of the whole business from first to last. With the facts of 1879-80 vividly in his mind, he strongly urged a complete withdrawal of British troops from the parts beyond the North-West frontier. We quote from the Memorandum:

22. . . . . As it is scarcely possible to continue the occupation of such stations as Jamrud, Ali Musjid, or even Lundi Kotal, without a greater exposure of life and health than the result warrants, my recommendation is to withdraw our troops altogether from the Khyber, and to place them in such situations *cis*-Indus as will ensure our having a healthy and serviceable force, fit to take the field at any time of the year.

23. To attain this result I would go as far as withdrawing all, or nearly all, the European troops from Peshawar, and reducing the garrison to the lowest possible strength.

The present seems to me to be a most favourable opportunity for carrying out this project, which has long been considered and recommended by many who know the Peshawar valley well. We have humbled Afghanistan, and destroyed the power of the Amír of Kabul. We have taught the Afghans and the tribes between Kabul and India that we accept no denial, that we can go where we will, that it is possible for us, whenever we may so desire, to advance rapidly on Kabul, and what is even more important, to remain there as long as we wish. This was deemed impossible by the tribes, even as far down as the Afridis, and it was implicitly believed that the inclemency of the winter, backed by a powerful combination of the Afghans, must result in our destruction. The reduction of the garrison at Peshawar would not, therefore, now be attributed to either fear or weakness; it would be regarded as part of the general scheme determined upon by us after the total overthrow of the Afghan power.

So long as our troops are located in the Khyber, a large garrison must be maintained at Peshawar. The occupation of these places cannot but be expensive, and will make the military service of the Government distasteful to the classes from which the Native Army is recruited. This is a most serious matter, and ought not to be dealt with theoretically; only persons who live amongst soldiers know the effect of quartering them in unhealthy places.

With this view Sir Donald Stewart, on July 2, 1880, expressed hearty agreement. Sir Donald was "satisfied that the political and military necessities of our frontier do not, under existing circumstances, require us to maintain garrisons either in Kurram or the Khyber," and that it was a complete mistake to lock up our troops in "advanced and unhealthy stations" beyond the Indus, "which are strong only in name." Sir Frederick Roberts advised the absolute abandonment of the Kurram line, and the limitation of our responsibilities on the Khyber route to "such as would ensure the execution and integrity of any guarantees we have given to the rulers of Lalpura and Kuner." The reasons that weighed with him then seem to be equally potent now:

§ 21. Viewing Kabul in the altered and powerless condition in which we shall leave it, with a ruler quite unable to cause us trouble or even anxiety in India, and knowing (as we now do) with what ease and quickness we can again at any time make ourselves masters of Kabul by either of the two roads under consideration, I can see no reason why regular troops should be kept either in the Kurram or the Khyber.

We are now also fully aware of the extraordinary difficulties which Russia would have to encounter were she at any time to advance upon India *via* Kabul, and to how great an extent we could injure and harass her by raising the tribes along the line of communication which it would be necessary for her to maintain, or by taking the initiative from our advanced, yet secure, base at Kandahar. The longer and more difficult the line of communication is, the more numerous and greater the obstacles which Russia would have to overcome; and, so far from shortening one mile of the road, I would let the web of difficulties extend to the very mouth of the Khyber Pass. . . . .

34. . . . We have nothing to fear from Afghanistan, and the best thing to do is to leave it as much as possible to itself.

35. It may not be flattering to our *amour propre*, but I feel sure that I am right when I say the less the Afghans see of us the less they will dislike us.

Should Russia in future years attempt to conquer Afghanistan or invade India through it, we should have a better chance of attaching the Afghans to our interests if we avoid all interference with them in the meantime.

All this argument stands as good to-day, in respect of the frontier tribes as well as of Afghanistan, as it did on May 12-29, 1880. The only difference is that Kabul was crippled then, while it is perfectly neutral now, as it has been for eighteen years, notwithstanding Lord Roberts's hasty aspersion on the Amír as to the arming of the border tribesmen.

Every attentive reader, however, will have observed one ominous clause which has been somewhat ignored by critics of Lord Roberts. Lord Roberts wrote on the assumption of our possessing an "advanced, yet secure base at Kandahar." That, however, went by the board; and this is the point where Lord Roberts was perhaps seen to effect a diversion. Yet it is at once obvious that, if we can "again at any time make ourselves masters of Kabul," it is at least as easy "again at any time to make ourselves masters of Kandahar."

We draw special attention to this point. Lord Roberts in clause 17 of his Kabul Memorandum said:

The Kandahar-Herat line certainly presents us with fewer difficulties than any other line. . . . This line, unless I am much mistaken, will henceforth be the theatre of any war carried on by us against the Afghans or Russians in Central Asia.

"We have neither sufficient men nor material to warrant our operating on more than one line" (§ 20); therefore he abandoned the Khyber and the Kurram, and stuck to the Bolan. Now, in connexion with all this one remarks two points. First, Mr. Curzon, who was ominously aggressive in the recent Debate, has advocated for many years "the forward move from the old Indus valley line across the Middle Belt"; that is to say at least the line of Lundi Kotal, Peiwar Kotal, and Chaman. Second, Colonel Hanna writes to us on "the proposed Kabul River railway." He says:

Following the windings of that river, where must it come out? At Lundi Khana, within the sphere of British political influence? No; at Dakka, in Afghan territory, so that to complete it the Indian Government must either bribe Abdur Rahman into ceding to us a position on which, we may be sure, he places a high value, or seize it as it seized New Chaman. The bribe, if very large, may be accepted, and turned into arms to be used against us later on; but I am inclined to think that it will be refused, and then we shall stand at once on the brink of a third Afghan war. . . . A word has still to be said about its political aspect as seen from the point of view of the Afridis, Mohmands, etc.; of its financial aspect, as looked at from the point of view of the Indian taxpayer, and of its practicability as judged from the standpoint of the engineer.

We leave the matter with these suggestions, in the meantime, and earnestly put it both to the Front Opposition Bench and to the Liberal Press whether indeed "the forward policy is dead." One will be curious to hear Lord Roberts both on the Kandahar line and on the Kabul line—seeing that now, as much as in 1880, "We have neither sufficient men nor material to warrant our operating on more than one line," and that the frontier tribes as well as the Afghans, "the less they see of us the

less they will dislike us." One also hopes to hear the Duke of Devonshire and to see how far he still agrees with the late Lord Hartington, sometime Secretary of State for India.

"THE LOGIC OF INDIAN DEFICIT."

By S. H. Swinny.

It is now some twenty-seven years since James Geddes, a young Indian Civil Servant, published a pamphlet entitled "The Logic of Indian Deficit," one of the strongest indictments of our government of India that has ever appeared, for its author was not a mere sentimentalist carried away by feelings that had no support from the hard facts of life, nor was he a dry financier, who could address himself only to those who were used to the study of blue-books and accounts, but a man whose vigour of onslaught and warmth of sympathy were always under the control of his firm grasp of reality and his special knowledge of the subject. He had many qualifications for his task. As a trusted Civil Servant he belonged to that "sahebdom" whose pride he flouted and whose pretensions he exposed, and thus he spoke with an authority which no outsider could claim. As one of the ruling race, his words could not be thrust aside with the insolent contempt with which the most temperate protests of the natives of India are received. As a Positivist, he was able to sympathise with forms of civilisation and types of character widely different from his own. His style was interesting and vigorous. His character compelled respect. And his outspoken attack on the evils of English administration, against all the promptings of interest and ambition, should ever entitle him to the love and remembrance of the people of India.

His first publication—alone referred to here—consists of less than fifty pages, an introduction in which he briefly sums up all the counts of a most damaging indictment against the English government in India, and three chapters in which that indictment, so far as it relates to matters of finance, is supported in detail.

In the view of Geddes, which he confirms by an analysis of the accounts, India, even in 1870, was practically bankrupt. Since the complete separation of trading and administrative accounts in 1834, there had, indeed, been eleven years of surplus against twenty-four of deficit; but even this, little as it seems, existed on paper only. As to the surplus of the first four years, that was easily accounted for. In 1834, the East India Company was compelled by the new Act of Parliament to give up the China trade, its trading capital being replaced by future payments out of Indian revenue. The ships and trading-gear became the property of the Indian Government, and the product of their sale being carried to the current account, produced the early surpluses under the new arrangement. And similarly every other surplus was a surplus on paper only, due to some trickery, to sales of stores, forestalment of revenue, or land-tax redemption, which, as it prevented any increase of that tax in the future, should have been treated as capital, not income. Two extraordinary cases are mentioned. In the one, a sum of £1,200,000, part of the product of a loan for which the scrip had not yet been issued, happening to be in the Treasury at the end of the financial year, was counted by the Indian authorities as revenue. In the other, some traffic receipts from railways not accounted for under their proper years were treated, when at last paid in, as income, although debt had been incurred to make up the deficiency. In reality, there had never been a surplus, and the machine of government had only been kept going by continually incurring fresh debt. "If, for any reason, England were ever to decline to lend any farther, the British Indian Empire would cease to meet the interest-charge of its debt. For it would cease to exist."

That the Budget could ever be balanced by an increase of taxation it seemed vain to hope. Not a year had passed since the Mutiny without an increase. In Madras the selling price of salt had been raised 70 per cent., while in Northern India the duty was 2,500 per cent. on the prime cost. The taxation on saltpetre had passed the limit of the possible, and the trade had been ruined. In fact, as Sir Charles Trevelyan said in 1870, "We have been doing nothing but devising new taxes since the great Mutiny." Nor did the drain to pay the interest on the debt tend to diminish by an increase in the native investment. Out of 195 millions of all kinds, 16 millions only were held by Indians, and the proportion was becoming smaller. And whether owing to the confiscation of securities held by rebels, or to what cause, little desire was shown by Indians to invest in the public debt, much even of the 16 millions being the money of minors, or money kept by the Courts during litigation, or the money of officials who had to hold Government securities as a guarantee. So the drain had kept on increasing. Well might Burke speak of "the commercial servitude of India."

Under these circumstances there remained only two remedies, the taxation of England in aid of India, or the reconstruction of native governments; and anything else was "mere juggling." Nor was this last remedy so terrible as some thought. "Our present government in India is far from being that good and fine thing which it is generally believed to be." It was in every way too expensive, and no more reasonable than it would be to plough an English farm with Derby winners. Nay, it was not only costly, but its costliness was increasing, because of the different rates of material progress in England and India. As to the old story that the increase of exports and imports proved an increase of prosperity, that is no more true in India than in Ireland. The exports are the drain to pay the debts of India—"coerced sales," demanding a larger and larger amount of produce to be sold. The imports, so far as they concern the natives at all and are not mere dead weight, government stores, etc., were only the sign of the break-down of Indian manufactures. On the contrary there was evidence on all sides that the country was growing poorer. The soil was becoming exhausted. As the Indians put it, "There is less blessing on the land in these latter days." Dearth and famine were more frequent, pauperism had become almost chronic, so that there had grown up the trade in coolies, and thousands of the most home-loving people in the world had to cross the sea to earn their bread. As to the much lauded railways, they were luxuries costly beyond the country's means, involving a dead loss of a million and a half per year—a loss which had to be shared by the whole country, that is by many who had never even seen a train; while the irrigation projects were financially worse than the railways. A large part of the so-called reproductive debt had been incurred by acquiring at par the shares of broken down English companies, shares which were previously at a heavy discount. Even the best of luxuries may sometimes be purchased at too dear a price.

But there were also other ways in which Geddes thought English rule caused disadvantage to India. It tended to break down, or at least weaken, the old religions and ways of life, while it had nothing to put in their place. Its only positive powers were two—"hard cash and sharp bayonets." Its strength lay in native disunion. And the most it could hope was to succeed in "policing people efficaciously." How pleasant this last must be to the people of India, we may judge by the feelings Londoners would have if they were governed by "a few Chinese mandarins who had begun late in life to acquire pigeon English." Nor is it surprising that the English rulers of India have been obliged to explain away their difficulties by attributing them to the "overwhelming turpitude of the native character."

In fact only some of the English middle-class have benefitted by our Empire in India. The Indian debt must sooner or later be repudiated, or fall on the tax-payers of this country. The export of capital to India has injured the workers at home. The drain of troops to India has prevented any real reorganisation of the army. But whether government by Indians is a good or a bad thing, it must come in the end. The juggling of Anglo-Indian financiers could not save the financial situation. They could not go on for ever consuming their capital and overcoming deficits with loans, "like some commander of a steamer at sea who should bank up the engine fire with ship's timbers for lack of coal and quench conflagrations between decks with petroleum. Let the ship's crew, let the consignors and consignees, let the underwriters see to it. Even the live cargo will bleat remonstrance. Let Sahebdom, let the English nation see to it. Even the natives are exclaiming."

Such were the views of Geddes twenty-seven years ago. It is for those who have studied Indian finance during that time to say how far they hold good now.

"FROM TONKIN TO INDIA."[1]

PRINCE HENRY OF ORLEANS'S volume is a fascinating record of such exploration and adventure as Central Asia alone can supply. The story is told with all the liveliness and realistic detail that have endeared the writings of the author's countryman, Jules Verne, to several generations of youth, and it has the additional advantage of being true. The plan of the expedition undertaken and successfully accomplished is best described in Prince Henry's own words:—

We turned our eyes farther north, where lay the hitherto unknown course of the Mekong in China. We felt that the work initiated by Lagrée and Francis Garnier ought to be continued by Frenchmen. Moreover, our explorations in China outside our own possessions would enable us to gather information that should be of profit to the peaceful commercial expansion of our colonies. Once up there, it would be idle to retrace our steps. When we should have ascended the valley of the Mekong as far as the point where the French missionaries had established themselves on the Thibetan-Chinese frontier, we should only have to turn to the left and reach India. Map travel is ever easy. The idea of a return through absolutely new countries took my companions' fancy; the proposal was carried unanimously, and our plan was made.

The exploring party consisted at first of three principals, Prince Henry, M. Roux, a French naval lieutenant, and M. Briffaud, a Tonkin colonist, and four followers. The starting-point, Hanoï, was left on January 26, 1895, and the Red River was ascended by steamer to Laokay and by junk to Manhao. Thence there was a land march to Mongtse, the baggage being conveyed on mules. At this place, the last town of comparative civilisation, a considerable halt was necessary. Mules had to be bought, followers to be hired, and many other preparations to be made. Chinese methods of doing business allowed ample time for observation, which the author turned to good account:—

Every week on market day the streets presented an interesting spectacle. At the entrance, outside the rampart, long strings of carrier oxen stood waiting behind the straw-wrapped bales of yarn or sheets of tin for the custom-house examination. Crowds of country folk thronged the gate, the Poula element predominating. The women of this race, with round faces sheltered under linen bonnets somewhat resembling those of the Little Sisters of the Poor, crouched beside baskets of vegetables. The men wore small open vests and a blue turban, round which they twisted their pigtails. Here an old beggar woman chanted her nasal plaint to the accompaniment of oblong castanets. She was not bewitching—we were far from an Esmeralda—but we threw her a few sapecks. There went by the tinker, with his professional cry of "Pouko! Pouko!" At a little distance squatted some men round a mat, silent for the most part, but each attentive to what was going on round him, as shown by the small and glittering eye. Some rustics who had made good bargains stopped to gamble away most of their gains to the Chinese. An umbrella with pink silk fringe came in view, and at sight of us was hastily and jealously lowered by the modest charmer. Mongtse and Lingau-Fou are said to be the only two Chinese towns where ladies of rank come out in this guise. I paused at the stall of a silversmith, and watched him at work as among the Laos States, his silver plate resting upon a wax mould fixed to a block, while with mallet and chisel he shaped his trinkets. A murmur behind us apprised us of the approach of some notable, and we drew ourselves up to let the procession pass.

Mongtse was quitted on February 27. The Red River was crossed, and afterwards the Black River. The route lay through the country of such tribes as the Hou-Nis, Lolos, and Hatous. The town of Ssumao was reached on April 7. Thence the party proceeded along the valley of the Mekong to Tali-Fou, where they lodged in the house of the veteran but active missionary, Father Leguilcher. Tali, a town of 20,000 souls, is of no great interest in itself, but its surroundings of mountain and lake and extraordinarily fertile plain, must be both striking and beautiful. The scientific collections made up to this point, with all superfluous baggage, were left behind with the French missionaries for remission to Mongtse. The caravan was reconstituted—30 mules and 16 men. The most important addition was a new interpreter, a Christian. He spoke no French, but he had been brought up from childhood by the fathers, had learnt Latin and studied philosophy. Latin, therefore, was to be the medium of intercourse. "By degrees we gained fluency, and in a month had completely mastered each other's idiosyncracies of expression. But what Latin! *Horresco referens!* Solecisms, barbarisms, neologisms, all the 'isms' invented might be applied to our jargon." Joseph proved himself a man of integrity and an invaluable servant.

Leaving Tali on June 14, the explorers pursued their way to Tsekou. They reached this, the "northern apex" of their enterprise, on August 14.

We had accomplished the exploration of the Chinese Mekong; we had verified the routes of Cooper, Gill, and the missionaries of Thibet, as well as those of Garnier and the Pavie Mission.

An interesting chapter is devoted to the sojourn at Tsekou, where the party were the guests of Father Dubernard, of whom Prince Henry writes with intense admiration.

As I marked his administration of his subjects, his help for the unfortunate, his care of the sick, and saw him supervising the harvest, laying by food for the improvident, and giving instruction to the young, he seemed to me to resemble some beneficent over-lord of the Middle Ages; or rather in the finest sense of the word, from which no reader need shrink, to be a true Socialist. . . . . Father Dubernard was venerated throughout the countryside and looked up to, at once for his wisdom and his care, as the benefactor of the land. His reputation for healing power was widespread. When smallpox ravaged the district he vaccinated more than nine thousand persons; and he told me with what success he had combated the prevalence of goitre by treating those afflicted with iodide of potassium.

Reluctantly renouncing the idea of penetrating into Thibet, the explorers now turned westwards, in the hope of solving the problem of the sources of the Salwen and the Irawadi, and "with India for our Promised Land, approached by a new route and longed for as a haven of rest." Again the caravan was reconstituted: twenty-four mafous of Chinese, Thibetan and Mosso race were engaged, the mules were reduced in number, and a start was made on September 10. The next section of the march was a particularly severe and perilous one, partly from the floods encountered in the deep and narrow gorges, partly from the difficulty of obtaining supplies. After these privations, Khamti, where the explorers were given an audience by the king, appeared a land of plenty, but it proved to be a land whose inhabitants were determined to sell everything dearly. The last stage of the route, Khamti to Assam, was the most trying of all. Roux and Briffaud, the interpreter Joseph, and many of the followers suffered terribly from fever and exhaustion. However, the Promised Land was reached at last, and to the weary travellers seemed a land "flowing with milk and honey." As the party passed through the towns of Assam "our men would follow us about, exclaiming at each step like schoolboys." "Inquijen (the English) prehendunt bonas terras!" was the admiring ejaculation of Joseph. One cannot but sympathise with Prince Henry's feelings, as he reflected that it was a Frenchman, Dupleix, who laid the first foundations of the mighty empire that was subsequently built up by the English. There is nothing ignoble in the Prince's regrets. He does the fullest justice to the superior administrative genius of the rival nation—"the grand freedom of the Colonist backed up by his Government," "a simplicity of administration in the hands of able men who know their way and take it."

This brief outline of the journey gives but a faint idea of the interest and value of the book. The appendices, chiefly the work of M. Roux, are a storehouse of important observations, ethnological, geographical, meteorological. One elaborate appendix is devoted to the flora and fauna; another to the vocabularies of thirty different tribes collected on the route; yet another gives reproductions, with translations, of Mosso and Lolo hieroglyphics; there is a map and a good index. In the body of the work the details given of savage customs and beliefs are of the utmost interest to the student of comparative folklore and comparative religion, and the numerous photographs of savages are still more eloquent and informing than the verbal descriptions. Much as the lover of truly artistic illustration may regret the vanished glories of the woodcuts of "the sixties," there cannot be two opinions as to the superiority of the camera in cases where an accurate record, as here, is of supreme importance. A word of praise must be given to the translator, whose version is remarkably easy and idiomatic. The printing and paper are luxurious.

[1] "From Tonkin to India by the Sources of the Irawadi" (January, '95—January, '96). By Prince Henri D'Orleans. Translated by Hamley Bent, M.A. Illustrated by G. Vuillier. London: Methuen and Co.

We learn from Bombay that the resolution of the recent Indian National Congress, with reference to the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, has been duly forwarded to Lord Welby. The resolution was engrossed on vellum, and enclosed in a silver casket.

WARFARE BEYOND THE FRONTIER.[1]

In these days of scientific study, it will not do for the aspiring soldier to rely upon personal bravery and the ancient nostrum of "common-sense" merely. Lord Wolseley tells him, and tells him truly, that "all now recognize that the officer who has not studied war as an applied science, and who is ignorant of modern military history, is of little use beyond the rank of captain." This is perfectly right and reasonable. The "common-sense" of an officer needs to be expanded and matured by systematic study of the diverse experiences of others, precisely as is the case in all other professions. The necessity of such preparation is especially pressing on military leaders, in view of the costliness of mistakes in action. Even as against savage enemies, it is of very great importance; and nowadays most of our savage enemies even have learned a thing or two from us in the conduct of warlike operations. The Afridis, we find, have learned to shoot, and to harass their opponents without risking an open battle. In fighting with less instructed enemies, indeed, a general will often break or modify a strategical or tactical rule that he would strenuously observe in its integrity with a civilised foe in front of him; but then the point is, how to apply the sound principle to the actual state of things before him, having due regard to the soldierly ability of his opponent. The more an officer knows, the more effectively will he marshal his knowledge for the present emergency. The "Wolseley" series is wisely designed for educative purposes, and the present volume is a very able contribution on a department that has unhappily acquired a perennial interest and importance. The illustrations are generally confined to the local experience of the last twenty years, owing to the recent developments in arms and in railway support; but incidentally they bring home the importance of general historical study of military operations. For instance, the "pacification" of Burma was carried out expressly on the basis of the system applied by Hoche in the subjugation of La Vendée; and the French transport in Madagascar is contrasted with the system pursued on the Chitral expedition.

Major Younghusband deals with all the main departments and conditions: mountain and forest and defensive warfare, engineering and pioneering, commissariat, transports and convoys, signalling and telegraphy, and the medical and political services. He gives a map to illustrate the Chitral campaign, and five or six plans to illustrate as many particular operations, including the battles of Ahmed Kheyl, Maiwand, and Charasia, and the defence of Thobal. The immediate circumstances give especial interest to the treatment of mountain warfare, mountain artillery, and the supporting organisations. Whether or not mountain warfare be the most difficult branch of the art of war need not be discussed here; it obviously has its fair share of difficulties. The tactics of the enemy are the least of all a commander's troubles; they are of the most primitive description, and they are usually met by the combined front and flank attack. The use of mountain artillery to cover and assist an infantry attack, and the importance of concentrating artillery fire, have been signally illustrated in the present campaign. The vastly improved armament of the Afridis, their remarkably good shooting, and the prevalence of the vexatious plan of "sniping," indicate new lines for the further expansion of methods to meet the enemy's developments; for other tribesmen may be relied upon to take this leaf out of the Afridi warbook when their turn comes round. Major Younghusband deals with the difficulties arising from lack of roads, and the lack or uncertainty of water and forage in the invaded region; and he points out that the moment a hitch occurs—and a hitch may very readily occur, unless there be extremely able management—is the moment that brings the border warrior from behind the rock, and offers him the opportunity of displaying his greatest skill. Much, too, depends on the climatic conditions: intense heat, intense cold, and the rainy season, must almost equally be avoided, under disastrous penalties. Besides, it is only where the spring and autumn crops of the borderland hill patches can be got at that an effective blow can be struck at the tribesmen's property. The principle of a bold initiative, so strongly laid down for Indian warfare in general, is well illustrated by the battle of Charasia (Oct. 6, 1879), Sir William Lockhart's operations in the Samana range (1891), Lord Roberts' march from Kabul to Kandahar, and Colonel Kelly's dash upon Chitral.

The fundamental thing, however, is to feed your fighting man and keep him fit in body and in mind. In no point, perhaps, is the difference between ancient and modern armies more marked than in the attention paid to the commissariat. "The secret of victory lies in the legs," said Marshal Saxe. "The secret of victory lies in the stomach," says Major Younghusband—especially on and beyond the Indian frontier. The exposition of this part of the organisation will bring home to the public mind the difficulties of even a small frontier expedition. The commissariat officer has to get together his supplies, pack them up (with very careful eye to their preservation in sound condition), and arrange with his colleague of the transport branch for their conveyance. From his main base at the port of disembarkation or at the head of the railway, he goes forward and establishes depôts, major and minor according to the disposition of the troops, along the line of communication and at the front, and arranges a continuous supply by a regular post-to-post system of convoys, and with local flying columns to sweep in eatables from the country around if there happen to be anything eatable in the vicinity. Think also of the care necessary to provide the different nationalities among the troops — British, Sikhs, Pathans, Gurkhas, Punjabis, Bengal and Bombay sepoys, Mandarins, Burmese, or whatever they be—with the appropriate national food; to see to it that all considerations of caste are stringently observed; and to protect the stores from the ravages and leakages of dishonesty by baffling the trained skill of contractors and departmental subordinates, European as well as Native. Then the transport officer has to find his men and his mules, camels, donkeys, bullocks, and elephants—especially his mules. There were upwards of 30,000 pack animals for the carriage and maintenance of the 18,000 men engaged in the relief of Chitral; and the numbers must be greatly larger in the present warfare. The practically absolute division of labour between the fighting men and the non-combatants improves the mobility of the force, but at the same time largely increases the difficulties of the campaign. We have had a temporary breakdown of the railway on the present occasion, and at least one case of shortcoming at the front; and we had a breakdown of the transport in the opening of the Chitral campaign immediately on the storming of the Malakand Pass. In these cases, the difficulties were undoubtedly of most formidable, and perhaps exceptional character; though there was a certain lack of experience at Malakand. On the whole, however, the amalgamated commissariat and transport department appears to work with astonishing success. Major Younghusband cites illustrative examples, as usual; and he is able to declare generally "that on no single occasion have the troops, through any fault of the department, failed to receive each man his daily ration," while "on the other hand, on several signal occasions, the forethought, energy, and administrative ability of commissariat officers have saved bodies of troops, if not from destruction, yet from probable decimation." The mind goes back with a bound to the glaring contrast of the Crimean War and the sufferings of the troops before Sebastopol.

We expressly refrain from following the author into the other divisions of the book. His exposition, however, will amply repay careful perusal. It is full of suggestion on all the main points, and the illustrations are selected with excellent judgment. It is a most instructive volume, written with ease and lucidity, so as to be followed by the civilian as easily as by the soldier. The more widely it is read, the more general will be the appreciation of what is meant by a frontier war or a punitive expedition. Its readers will have no difficulty in understanding the humiliating failure that has attended the Tirah campaign. Sir William Lockhart is beyond question the most fully qualified of all our general officers to deal with such a military problem. But the stupendous mountains, the narrow passes, the lack of roads, the difficulty of locomotion and of transport, the exposure of officers and men to the sharpshooters of the enemy: these and such points reduce the idea of the campaign to a mental aberration of Government. With our home-staying notions of these things, and our blank confidence in our military prowess, we fail to realize the actual difficulties, until they are brought home to us by multiplied disaster. Those who study Major Younghusband will get their eyes opened. Unhappily it is not possible to foresee a time when the volume will be rendered obsolete by the prevalence of frontier peace.

[1] *Indian Frontier Warfare.* By Captain and Brevet-Major G. J. Younghusband. Vol. III of "The Wolseley Series," Edited by Captain Walter H. James. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., Ltd.

THE WEEK IN PARLIAMENT.

BY OUR OWN ONLOOKER.

It was obvious early in the proceedings on Thursday last that the somewhat affectionate attitude of the Irish towards Mr. Gerald Balfour which marked the introduction of the Irish Local Government Bill was not to be maintained. During question time there was every symptom of a coming squall. There was a shrill tone of defiance in the Chief Secretary's replies, and shouts of scorn and anger from the benches opposite. Mr. Dillon had established himself in the corner usually occupied by Mr. T. M. Healy, and directly questions were over he asked leave to move the adjournment of the House. All the Irish and not a few Radicals sprang to their feet in support, and so the debate began. The trouble arose out of "the extraordinary language used by the Crown Prosecutor in the Court-house at Westport" on the previous Thursday, and the subsequent action of the police in violently dispersing a public meeting without notice or proclamation. For a time the exchange of "compliments" across the floor of the House was

exceedingly lively. Mr. Balfour took up the old official attitude of contradicting point blank everything said by the Nationalists. In particular he denied that any meeting had been held, and to crown all he enlarged upon the serious interruption to traffic in Westport. I am assured by those who know that nothing worthy of being termed traffic has ever been seen, or is even likely to be seen, in the somnolent streets in question. The debate ended, of course, in the defeat of the Nationalists; but it was not without significance as showing that the millenium has not been ushered in by Mr. Gerald Balfour.

The debates which took place at the same sitting with regard to Abyssinia and West Africa revealed, as such debates so often do, how little the vast majority of the members know about these subjects on which they are asked to vote. Sir Charles Dilke attacked our recent treaty with the Emperor Menelik as being almost equally open to condemnation, because of its contents and its omissions. He is one of the few experts on such subjects. He was supported by Mr. A. E. Pease, whose roving disposition has led him to Abyssinia and many another strange region. He is the member whose return at a by-election was made known to him in the depths of some mysterious jungle where he was shooting big game—the news having been jogging along by camels and runners for weeks. When Mr. Curzon had defended the treaty and Sir E. Grey had said that it was a mixture of good, bad, and indifferent, the members divided, and approved of its provisions by 162 to 76. It is doubtful whether half-a-dozen of them really comprehended the matter. Later on Mr. Labouchere attacked our policy of increasing our spheres of influence in West Africa. He did not think the markets in that part of the world were worth having. Perhaps the chief feature of his speech was a bitter attack on Mr. Chamberlain, whom he accused of talking the "veriest trash" and of lusting after the leadership of the Tory party. Mr. Chamberlain took notes and looked particularly "evil" under these attentions. It was thought that he would reply with another slashing speech. Apparently, however, he recognised the delicacy of the situation between this country and France, and for once was temperate. Sir E. Grey promised the Government the support of Liberals so long as the Government were both firm and conciliatory in their dealings with France. It was generally recognised that the time had not come to condemn the Government, before the papers relating to this part of their policy had been issued, and so Mr. Labouchere was defeated by the emphatic vote of 234 to 27.

The feature of Friday's sitting was the introduction by Mr. Brodrick of the Army Estimates, and his explanation of the Government's scheme for increasing the army. He spoke nearly two hours, and of course was complimented on the "admirable lucidity of his statement." This is invariably the case with front-bench men who speak for more than an hour. It is safe to say, however, that with the exception of the service members, few could really grasp what it was all about—and even the service members were not agreed. It is certainly impossible to condense into anything like reasonable space all the talk about army corps, battalions, regiments, army reservists, recruits, infantry, cavalry, and artillery, the Indian army, and so on and so forth. This much was clear—we are to have a much larger army than has ever been known before except in time of European war, and naturally we are to pay much more for it. There are some attempts being made also to make the ranks more attractive to "Tommy Atkins." But Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Arnold-Forster, the two experts often dubbed "amateur strategists" did not think much of the proposals. Then a dense cloud of captains and colonels, of majors and generals, settled down on the House, and the debate was continued on Monday. Perhaps the chief feature of Monday's talk was a speech by Lord Charles Beresford, who spoke up for the "scallywag," or the soldier who gets into trouble. He made the remark that had he gone into the army he would certainly have been often in trouble and would never have got employment after—and the whole House cheered its emphatic agreement. Mr. Labouchere tried to reduce the number of men in the army as a protest against the war-fever at present afflicting the country. He got but little support in spite of the fact that he announced himself as a disciple of Sir Robert Peel—"not the present Sir Robert," he made haste to add. After the vote fixing the number of men had been agreed to, a vote of no less than £6,266,400 for pay was proposed. Nobody said a word until the vote was almost passed, when Mr. Caldwell was heard to exclaim almost despairingly, "What, six millions!" And it was so; the vote went through without another remark.

On Tuesday everybody began to talk about a "count" almost directly the House met, and before nine the expected had happened. There was one little bit of private business that was not without significance. The Wymondham Water Bill came up for second reading, and was contemptuously kicked out without a division. All the members for East Anglia fell on it tooth and nail, as a Bill to allow some London speculators to exploit a Norfolk district. Two points deserve special notice. Mr. Fellowes, a member of the Government, speaking from the Treasury Bench, declared that if waterworks were required at Wymondham they should be established by the Local District Board—the very principle which in London is denounced by Mr. Fellowes' friends as Socialism. The other point is that Mr. J. W. Lowther, Chairman of Committees, spoke strongly in favour of the Bill, and yet in the teeth of that it was not only rejected, but flung out amid contemptuous laughter without a division!

Only two other little incidents before the welcome count out impressed me. One was that Sir Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett asked if the forts at Port Arthur are occupied by the Russians, and was informed that there are no forts there at all! The other was that Mr. MacAleese brought in a Bill granting permission to people of Irish extraction or birth the right to prefix "O" or "Mac" to their names. This was felt to be no party question, and was received with general favour.

[We regret that by a printer's error "Our Own Onlooker" was last week (page 119, line 28) made to describe an amendment as "very supplementary." The word "very" was of course inserted in error.—Ed. India.]

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

Thursday, February 24.—A Parliamentary paper was issued containing Mr. Chamberlain's despatch which embodied the draft-scheme for the reconstitution of the British South Africa Company, the observations upon it of Sir Alfred Milner, High Commissioner for South Africa, the Cape Ministry, and the company itself, with the reply of the Colonial Office to the company's remarks.

Friday, February 25.—The Queen held the first Drawing Room of the season at Buckingham Palace. The Diplomatic and General Circles were well attended, and about 200 presentations were made.

Another Liberal success was achieved in the Cricklade Division of North Wilts, where polling took place on Thursday to fill the Parliamentary vacancy caused by the retirement of Mr. A. Hopkinson, Liberal Unionist. Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice, the Liberal candidate, was declared elected by a majority of 489—5,624 votes being cast for him, as against 5,135 for his Conservative opponent, Lord Emlyn. This was the seventh seat the Liberals had gained since the General Election.

The fight for London became hotter, and many meetings on behalf of the County Council candidates were held. The speakers included Lord Ripon, Lord Welby, Mr. Augustine Birrell, M.P., and Mr. Herbert Gladstone, M.P., for the Progressives; and Lord George Hamilton, M.P., and Lord Balfour of Burleigh for the Moderates.

The Pekin Correspondent of *The Times* said that the Chinese Government having authorised a Chinese syndicate to construct, with foreign assistance, presumably American, a trunk line from Tien-tsin to Chin-kiang through Shantung, the German Minister has intervened on the ground that Germany had been accorded the refusal of the right to construct any railway in Shan-tung. The proposal was, therefore, blocked.

Saturday, February 26.—A most deliberate attempt was made on the life of the King of Greece. His Majesty was returning in the evening from his usual drive towards Phalerum when two men, armed with Gras rifles, who had been lying concealed in a ditch by the side of the road, sprang to their feet and began to fire at the Royal carriage. One of the men advanced into the middle of the road and fired at the King as the carriage approached. His Majesty, who was accompanied by his daughter, the Princess Marie, rose to his feet and placed himself in front of the Princess in order to shield her. Fortunately, the assassins were unable to hit either the King or the Princess, but a footman was wounded and two of the horses were also struck by bullets. The coachman, when he saw the danger, lashed his horses and drove rapidly away. The assassins escaped towards Hymettus, but the country is being scoured by police. A thanksgiving service was held in the Palace Chapel in the evening. Great indignation was shown when the news of the attempt became known.

Lord Kimberley was the principal speaker at the annual dinner of the Eighty and Russell Clubs, held in Oxford, on Saturday evening, under the presidency of Mr. Herbert Paul. Responding to the toast of the Liberal party, Lord Kimberley referred with satisfaction to the result of the Cricklade election, and expressed unswerving adherence to the programme of the party. Having criticised the attitude of the Tories towards the London County Council, Lord Kimberley protested against a forward military policy beyond the frontier of India.

From Pekin it was announced that the Chinese Government had agreed to the opening of Yuen-Chau as a treaty port, and that Japan intended to ask for explanations from China should the Russian fleet not quit Port Arthur when navigation at the northern ports was reopened. As soon as the indemnity is paid, it was said the Japanese would retire from Wei-hai-Wei.

Monday, February 28.—Lord Ripon was among those who addressed meetings in London in support of the Progressives. He declared that the present election transcended in importance all previous elections of the kind, since the very existence

of the Council as an efficient municipal body was at stake. A great deal had been said by the Moderates about Tammany—a word that in the mouth of an Englishman meant corruption—but they must be hard put about for arguments in support of their policy if they had to use poisoned weapons of that sort. The Progressives put the interests of the public as a whole before those of sections of the community such as shareholders of gas and water companies.

One of the men who attempted to kill King George of Greece was arrested. He refused to give the name of his accomplice, and was stated to belong to a class of men "of doubtful repute."

The Queen conferred the Victoria Cross upon Lord Fincastle, of the Lancers, at Windsor Castle yesterday afternoon, for bravery on the field during the Indian Frontier Campaign.

TUESDAY, March 1.—Lord Rosebery addressed a magnificent meeting in St. James's Hall, under the auspices of the London County Council Progressive Committee. There were, he pointed out, two great dangers with which they were now confronted—the introduction of party politics into the municipal arena and the partition of London itself.

M. Hanotaux made a statement in the French Chamber respecting the Niger. He said the Commission was actively pursuing its labours, and though difficulties were naturally encountered, there was every reason to hope that the Commission would arrive at a settlement of the pending questions in a manner consistent with the interests of both England and France. Owing to the difficulty of communicating with distant regions, a regrettable impression was sometimes produced by reports which were disseminated; but he had confidence in the friendly dispositions of the two Governments, and in the instructions given to their officers on the spot.

The second of the two assailants of King George of Greece was arrested, and confessed his guilt.

A contract was reported to have been signed between the Chinese Revenue Board and the Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation for a loan at four and a half per cent., redeemable in forty-five years.

WEDNESDAY, March 2.—The Paris *Temps*, in an article dealing with the West Africa question, said that France was in effective possession of the greater portion of the triangle between the Niger, the meridian of Say, and the 9th degree of longitude, and that Great Britain was trying to dislodge her by newspaper articles, which left her unmoved; but as the newspaper warfare might create on both side a regrettable state of mind, it was to be hoped that reciprocal concessions might soon result in an agreement.

The Viceroy unveiled at Calcutta a statue of Lord Roberts, erected by subscriptions amounting to nearly a lakh of rupees. The parade of troops was said to be the largest ever held in Calcutta.

THE NEW LAW OF SEDITION.

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE.

In view of the extreme importance of the repressive legislation which is now being hurried through the Viceroy's Council, it may be well to set forth, as clearly as possible, the provisions of the new measures.

The first measure (which was passed into law after a nine hours' sitting on February 18 last) is to amend the Penal Code. The original clauses of the Amendment Bill as introduced by Mr. Chalmers were as follows :—

THE ORIGINAL PROPOSALS.

Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code is hereby repealed, and the following Section is substituted therefor, namely :—

Whoever by words either spoken or written, or by signs, or by visible representation, or otherwise, brings or attempts to bring into hatred or contempt, or excites or attempts to excite disaffection towards her Majesty or the Government, or promotes or attempts to promote feelings of enmity or ill-will between different classes of her Majesty's subjects, shall be punished with transportation for life or any shorter term, to which fine may be added, or with imprisonment, which may extend to ten years, to which fine may be added, or with fine.

Explanation 1.—The expression "disaffection" includes disloyalty and all feelings of enmity or ill-will.

Explanation 2.—Comments on the measures of the Government with a view to obtain their alteration by lawful means, without exciting or attempting to excite hatred, contempt or disaffection, do not constitute an offence.

Section 505 of the Indian Penal Code is hereby repealed and the following Section is substituted therefor, namely :—

505. Whoever makes, publishes or circulates any statement, rumour or report,—

(*a*) With intent to cause, or which is likely to cause, any officer, soldier or sailor in the Army or Navy of her Majesty or in the Royal Indian Marine or in the Imperial Service Troops to Mutiny or otherwise disregard or fail in his duty as such; or

(*b*) With intent to cause, or which is likely to cause, fear or alarm to the public, or to any section of the public whereby they may be induced to commit an offence against the State or against the public tranquillity; or

(*c*) With intent to incite, or which is likely to incite, any class or community of persons to commit any offence against any other class or community; shall be punished with imprisonment of either description which may extend to two years, or with fine, or with both.

Exception.—It does not amount to an offence, within the meaning of this Section, to make, publish or circulate any such statement, rumour or report, as aforesaid, when such statement, rumour or report is true, and is made, published or circulated without such intent as aforesaid.

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE.

These proposed changes in the law were referred to a Select Committee, who presented their Report to the Viceroy's Council on February 4. Their Report, which we take from *The Gazette of India*, was as follows :—

We, the undersigned, Members of the Select Committee to which the Bill to amend the Indian Penal Code in relation to Extra-territorial Offences was referred, have considered the Bill with the further amendments in the Penal Code given notice of at the meeting of Council held on the 21st of December, 1897, and the papers noted in the list appended, and have now the honour to submit this our Report, with the Bill as amended by us annexed thereto.

2. Clause 2.—We have altered illustration (*b*) to this clause by making it apply to a Native State in India. We think it is unsafe to attempt to define the status of tribal territory in an illustration.

3. Clause 4.—We have carefully considered the new clause proposed by the Government, and we have inserted it in the Bill with the following amendments :—

(*a*) For the expression "the Government" we have substituted the phrase "the Government established by law in British India." This restores the language of the Act of 1870. Having regard to the terms of section 17 of the Indian Penal Code, which defines "Government," the omission of the words "established by law in British India" might be held to give an extended meaning to the term "Government," whereas it ought to have exactly the same meaning as in the Act of 1870.

(*b*) We have altered the term of imprisonment from ten years to three, thus restoring the law of 1870. The term of ten years is provided as an alternative for transportation in sections 121A and 122; but apparently the framers of the Act of 1870, in section 124A, wished to draw a marked distinction between minor offences and offences of a very serious character where transportation would be the only appropriate punishment.

(*c*) We have omitted the words "or promotes or attempts to promote feelings of enmity or ill-will between different classes of her Majesty's subjects," and have framed a new clause to deal with the offence thereby indicated. It appears to us that the offence of stirring up class-hatred differs in many important respects from the offence of sedition against the State. It comes more appropriately in the Chapter relating to offences against the public tranquillity. The offence only affects the Government or the State indirectly, and the essence of the offence is that it predisposes classes of the people to action which may disturb the public tranquillity. The fact that this offence is punishable in England as seditious libel is probably due to historical causes, and has nothing to do with logical arrangement.

(*d*) We have omitted the words "or ill-will" at the conclusion of Explanation 1. The expression "all feelings of ill-will" appears to us to be too wide and vague. It is only when feelings of ill-will amount to disloyalty or enmity that they constitute such disaffection as is contemplated by the clause. A certain amount of ill-will may be compatible with genuine loyalty.

(*e*) We have added Explanation 3 to make it clear that criticism on the action of Government is not confined to cases in which it is sought to bring about an alteration of what has been done. For example, suppose the Government make an appointment which is considered objectionable. That appointment may be criticised, although the criticism may not have in view the cancellation of the appointment. We have made consequential amendments in Explanation 2 to make the language of the two Explanations uniform.

Clause 5.—The object of framing this clause has already been detailed. In framing it we have altered the words "enmity or ill-will" into "enmity or hatred," and we have fixed the maximum punishment at two years' imprisonment.

We recommend that the clause when passed should be included in Section 196 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, so that offences under it only be prosecuted under the authority or with the sanction of the Government.

5. Clause 6.—We have inserted the clause proposed by the Government, but we have altered and enlarged the scope of the exception to the clause. No doubt the statements, rumours and reports referred to are of a highly mischievous character, but, having regard to the conditions under which modern journalism and the discussion of public questions are necessarily carried on, we think that, when the statement, rumour or report is published without any criminal intent, it is going too far to require the person who published it to prove its actual truth. To require such proof might be throwing an impossible burden upon him, and it should be sufficient for him to show that he had reasonable grounds for believing it; as, for instance, by showing that he made due inquiry before he published it.

M. D. CHALMERS, C. M. RIVAZ, C. C. STEVENS, H. E. M. JAMES, P. ANANDA CHARLU, G. H. P. EVANS, LAKSHMISHWAR SINGH.

Sir G. H. P. Evans added that he thought the words "tending to the disturbance of public tranquillity," or words to that effect might be advantageously inserted in Section 153A.

Mr. Ananda Charlu and the Mahárájá of Darbhanga appended minutes of dissent.

Mr. Ananda Charlu's Minute of Dissent.

Mr. Ananda Charlu's Minute of Dissent was as follows:—

So far as I know, there never has been any serious doubt expressed as to the true meaning of Section 124A now in the Penal Code. No difficulty could arise, except upon the view that the explanation attached to the Section cannot be read along with it as virtually defining the term "disaffection." It has thus become urgent to remove the difficulty interposed by that view. This is best met by throwing the substance of the explanation into the form of a definition as follows:—"Feelings of disaffection mean all feelings incompatible with a disposition to render obedience to the lawful authority of the Government established by law in British India, and to support the lawful authority thereof against unlawful attempts to subvert or resist that authority." This, which has come from the Defence Association, I suggested in Committee, and the majority were against me. By adding to such a definition provisos, such as Mr. Stephen has made part of his Section 102 in his "Draft Code," the law will, in my judgment, be elucidated far better than by the proposed explanations which I am for omitting. As a necessary consequence, the proposed words "hatred," "contempt," and "enmity" are, in my opinion, the very worst that could be chosen. Standing by themselves, they are in the last degree vague, misleading, and obscure, by giving room for no small amount of fanciful speculation. They cannot fail to prove most hurtful to public interest by spreading a sense of uncertainty, and virtually stifling all frank discussion of public questions. I would, therefore, score out from the clause now proposed the words "to bring into hatred or contempt," etc. I may also point out that the definition I have recommended would be wide enough to cover all forms of real political hatred which should be penalised. I very much doubt whether what is proposed in the Bill as contained in these objected words, is good or sound law at the present day. I am for eliminating the penalty of transportation from the Section. A study of the history of this Section shows how it is a mistake in the Section, and how the Law Commissioners who sat on the original draft Penal Code criticised it in strong terms. The danger of retaining it has already been once exemplified, and may be any day exemplified again and again. The danger lies in its being viewed, as it is too sure to be viewed by not a few, as the maximum permissible in all cases except where extenuating circumstances or other grounds for leniency exist. I am opposed to the proposed clause 153A as a dangerous piece of legislation, and as being impolitic (among other reasons) by necessitating Government to side with, or to appear to side with, one party as against another. In my humble judgment, it will only accentuate the evil which it is meant to remove. Far from healing differences which still linger, or which now and then come to the surface, it would widen the gap by encouraging insidious men to do mischief in stealth, with the sure hope that the Government would come down on such as openly resented. It will have all the repressive effects which the proposed amendments on 124A cannot fail to have, much to the detriment of undoubted rights and useful work. In clause 505, as proposed to be altered, I would omit the words "or which is likely to cause" from each of (*a*), (*b*), and (*c*), and substitute the words "and thereby to induce any person," for the words "whereby any person may be induced" in (*b*), intent being in this, as in 124A, the essence of the offence. The words which I have objected to must of necessity introduce a world of confusion which might be easily illustrated. They are bound to operate prejudicially to public good. It is perhaps necessary to add with reference to clause 153A, and the changes in 505, that whereas the prior sanction of Government which is prescribed will be something of a guarantee, it will mostly depend on the strength with which the case is urged by the district officers; for I fear that in the face of a strong representation by the latter, the Government would naturally, and perhaps not improperly, hesitate to take upon itself the responsibility of withholding sanction. The mischief of these Sections lies not so much in the natural results which will follow, as in the unnatural and exaggerated dread they would undesirably inspire in most cases. In such a result the balance of advantage will not be on the side of the public.

Minute of Dissent by the Mahárájá of Darbhanga.

The Mahárájá of Darbhanga appended a Minute of Dissent as follows:—

I sign the report subject to the following observations:—

1. I think that, in accordance with the opinion of the majority of the Judges of the Calcutta High Court, it should be clearly stated in Section 124A that the intention to produce the effects mentioned therein is the basis of the offence. A similar alteration should be made in Explanation 2, and after the words "by lawful means" the words "or for the purpose merely of showing that they are erroneous but" should be inserted, and after the word "without" the words "the intention of" should be added. As the High Court has pointed out, comments made for such a purpose and without the *intention* of exciting hatred or disaffection are legitimate and allowable. Criminal intent is the essence of the law of sedition as it prevails in England. It should be made quite clear that in all prosecutions under Sections 124A, 153A, and 505, the onus shall lie on the prosecution to prove the intention in the mind of the accused at the time, or, at all events, to adduce such evidence as to enable the Court reasonably to infer the same from his acts. In this as in all other penal cases the accused is entitled to demand that his guilt shall be fully proved against him by the prosecution beyond all reasonable doubt. I submit that this class of prosecutions should not be exceptionally dealt with, but that they should be called upon to discharge the duties which ordinarily belong to all prosecutions in criminal cases, *viz.*, that the burden of proving the offence lies on them.

2. Having regard to the language of Explanation 1, and to recent judicial rulings on the meaning of "disaffection," it seems to me that the words "brings or attempts to bring into hatred or contempt or" are superfluous, and may lead to unnecessary difficulties. As regards "hatred" I must confess that I am no better able than is Worcester's Dictionary to distinguish between the meaning of that word and "enmity," the term which is employed in Explanation 1. As regards "contempt" the idea conveyed by that word seems to be fully covered by the rest of the section, unless indeed it is desired to give so dangerous an extension to the scope of the section as will enable Government to prosecute to a conviction persons responsible for those cartoons, skits or other comic productions with which newspapers and other periodicals not infrequently try to enliven their readers.

3. I think further that the definition of "disaffection" in Explanation 1 to Section 124A is far too vague, and would recommend the adoption in its place of some such definition as that suggested by the European and Anglo-Indian Defence Association. I quote it here for the sake of convenience:—"Feelings of disaffection means all feelings incompatible with a disposition to render obedience to the lawful authority of the Government established by law in British India, and to support the lawful authority thereof against unlawful attempts to subvert or resist that authority."

4. The remarks I have made in paragraph 1 with regard to the importance of making the intention the basis of the offence contemplated by the new Section 124A apply equally to the offence contemplated by the new Section 153A. It should be clearly stated in the section that *mens rea* is an essential ingredient of the offence under Section 153A.

5. Both Section 153A and Section 505 when passed should be included in Section 196 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, so that offenders under them should be prosecuted only under the authority and with the sanction of the Local Government.

6. There is one more point with regard to Section 124A which has, I think, been overlooked and which to my mind is of great importance. The section, as it stands, is far too comprehensive. It appears to me that some attempt should be made to restrict the discretion of Judges in inflicting punishment. For instance, under the proposed section it is quite possible to punish a journalist or a public speaker who is only guilty of using indiscreet language calculated at most to give rise to trifling feelings of irritation. Surely such action on the part of the journalist or the public speaker ought not to be considered as a penal offence. I think there should be some differentiation between the punishment allotted for acts like those mentioned above and for intentional acts of sedition.

The Bill as Amended.

The following is the text of the Bill as amended by the Select Committee:—

A Bill to amend the Indian Penal Code.

Whereas it is expedient to amend the Indian Penal Code; it is hereby enacted as follows:—

Short Title and Commencement.

1. (1) This Act may be called the Indian Penal Code Amendment Act, 1898; and (2) it shall come into force at once.

Substitution of New Section for Section 4, Act XLV, 1860.

2. Section 4 of the Indian Penal Code is hereby repealed, and the following section is substituted therefor, namely:—

Extension of Code to Extra-territorial Offences.

"4. The provisions of this Code apply also to any offence committed by—

"(1) Any Native Indian subject of Her Majesty in any place without and beyond British India; (2) any other British subject within the territories of any Native Prince or Chief in India; (3) any servant of the Queen, whether a British subject or not, within the territories of any Native Prince or Chief of India.

"Explanation.—In this section the word 'offence' includes every act committed outside British India, which, if committed in British India, would be punishable under this Code.

"Illustrations.

"(*a*) A, a coolie, who is a native Indian subject, commits a murder in Uganda. He can be tried and convicted of murder in any place in British India in which he may be found.

"(b) B, a European British subject, commits a murder in Kashmir. He can be tried and convicted of murder in any place in British India in which he may be found.

"(c) C, a foreigner who is in the service of the Punjab Government, commits a murder in Jhind. He can be tried and convicted of murder at any place in British India in which he may be found.

"(d) D, a British subject living in Indore, instigates E to commit a murder in Bombay. D is guilty of abetting murder."

ABETMENT IN BRITISH INDIA OF OFFENCES OUTSIDE IT.

3. After Section 108 of the Indian Penal Code the following Section shall be added, namely:—

ABETMENT IN BRITISH INDIA OF OFFENCES OUTSIDE IT.

"108A. A person abets an offence within the meaning of this Code, who, in British India, abets the commission of any act without and beyond British India which would constitute an offence if committed in British India.

ILLUSTRATION.

A, in British India, instigate B, a foreigner in Goa, to commit a murder in Goa. A is guilty of abetting murder.

SUBSTITUTION OF NEW SECTION FOR SECTION 124A, ACT XLV, 1860.

4. Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code is hereby repealed, and the following Section is substituted therefor, namely:—

SEDITION.

"124A.—Whoever by words, either spoken or written; or by signs, or by visible representation, or otherwise, brings or attempts to bring into hatred or contempt, or excites or attempts to excite disaffection towards her Majesty or the Government established by law in British India, shall be punished with transportation for life or any shorter term, to which fine may be added, or with imprisonment which may extend to three years, to which fine may be added, or with imprisonment which may extend to three years, to which fine may be added, or with fine.

Explanation 1.—The expression "disaffection" includes disloyalty and all feelings of enmity. Explanation 2.—Comments expressing disapprobation of the measures of the Government with a view to obtain their alteration by lawful means, without exciting or attempting to excite hatred, contempt or disaffection, do not constitute an offence under this Section.

Explanation 3.—Comments expressing disapprobation of the administrative or other action of the Government without exciting or attempting to excite hatred, contempt or disaffection do not constitute an offence under this Section."

ADDITION OF NEW SECTION AFTER SECTION 153, ACT XLV, 1860.

5. After Section 153 of the Indian Penal Code the following Section shall be inserted, namely:—

PROMOTING ENMITY BETWEEN CLASSES.

"153A. Whoever by words, either spoken or written, or by signs, or by visible representations, or otherwise, promotes or attempts to promote feelings of enmity or hatred between different classes of her Majesty's subjects shall be punished with imprisonment which may extend to two years, or with fine, or with both."

SUBSTITUTION OF NEW SECTION FOR SECTION 505, ACT XLV, 1860.

6. Section 505 of the Indian Penal Code is hereby repealed, and the following Section is substituted therefor, namely:

STATEMENTS CONDUCING TO PUBLIC MISCHIEF.

"505. Whoever makes, publishes or circulates any statement, rumour or report,—

"(a) With intent to cause, or which is likely to cause, any officer, soldier or sailor, in the army or navy of her Majesty or in the Royal Indian Marine or in the Imperial Service Troops to mutiny or otherwise disregard or fail in his duty as such; or

"(b) With intent to cause, or which is likely to cause, fear or alarm to the public, or to any section of the public whereby any person may be induced to commit an offence against the State or against the public tranquillity; or

"(c) With intent to incite, or which is likely to incite, any class or community of persons to commit any offence against any other class or community; shall be punished with imprisonment which may extend to two years, or with fine, or with both."

Exception.—It does not amount to an offence, within the meaning of this section, when the person making, publishing or circulating any such statement, rumour or report has reasonable grounds for believing that such statement rumour or report is true and makes, publishes or circulates it without any such intent as aforesaid.

THE NEW ACT.

It would appear from the telegraphic reports that the foregoing Bill was passed into law with the addition of an amendment proposed by Sir G. H. Evans. This amendment provided that the following explanation be added to Section 153A:—

It does not amount to an offence to point out without malicious intention, and with an honest view to their removal, matters which are producing or have a tendency to produce feelings of enmity or hatred between the different classes of her Majesty's subjects.

The following notices of motion, for which no days have been fixed, appear on the papers of the House of Commons: Sir Joseph Pease—Opium,—To call attention to the trade between India and China in Opium; and to move a Resolution. Mr. Pickersgill—East India (Penal Code),—That a humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty will be pleased to disallow the Indian Penal Code Amendment Act, 1898.

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, February 24.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS PRESENTED.

East India (Contagious Diseases Acts).—Petitions against State regulation. From Southport, Liverpool, Leeds, Bishop Auckland, and Stirling. To lie upon the Table.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA. DEATHS FROM STARVATION.

Mr. MENDL asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would give the figures as to the mortality in India consequent on the recent famine in that country.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Papers are now being printed for presentation to Parliament, which contain the death rates month by month for each famine district in India from the beginning of the famine down to the end of November, 1897. The papers have been with the printers for some time, and I hope they may be distributed during March.

THE INDIAN MINTS.

Mr. BRAMSTON BEACH asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the attention of the Government had been drawn to the vote by the Central and Associated Chambers of Agriculture on the 1st inst., endorsing the recommendations of the supplementary report of the majority of the Royal Agricultural Commission:

And, what steps the Government intended to take in the interest of British and Irish Agriculture in order to obtain the re-opening of the Mints of India to the coinage of silver.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have seen a newspaper report of the vote to which my hon. friend refers. As regards the second part of his question, he is no doubt acquainted with the correspondence which passed on the subject of a recent proposal to re-open the Indian Mints, and which was published last October.

I am not in a position to make any statement with respect to the policy of the Government of India beyond what may be gathered from that correspondence.

THE POONA MURDERS. WAS DAMODAR CHAPEKAR BRIBED TO CONFESS?

Mr. DAVITT asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been drawn to a statement to the effect that Damodar Chapekar, now under sentence of death for the Poona murders, declared on his trial that a police superintendent had promised him a sum of 20,000 rupees and employment for his brother in the police:

And, whether any information upon this matter had been received from the Indian Government; and, if not, whether an inquiry would be made to ascertain if such a declaration was made at any time by the condemned man.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have received no information from the Government of India as to the trial of Damodar Chapekar, but I have seen a newspaper report of it, from which I gather that he did make the statement referred to in the question. I also gather that no credit was attached to it; and, as at present advised, I see no reason for making any special inquiry on the subject.

INDIA AND THE NEW ARMY PROPOSALS.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he could state to the House what increased Military expenditure would be entailed upon the Indian exchequer in the event of the Military reforms proposed by the Government being carried into Law:

And, whether the Government of India was consulted before these proposals were made, and gave its assent thereto.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have been and am still in communication with the Government of India regarding the proposals of the War Office, but I have not yet received their final reply.

THE INDIAN TROOPS FOR MOMBASA.

Mr. MACLEAN asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs who was to pay the expenses of the Indian troops sent from Bombay to Mombasa for service in Uganda.

Mr. CURZON: The Imperial Government will bear all charges.

"BARBAROUS" BULLETS.

Mr. HEDDERWICK asked the Secretary of State for India, whether Dum-dum or explosive bullets had been employed against her Majesty's troops in the North-West frontier campaign:

Whether the use of such missiles was opposed to the canons of International Law:

And, whether the Government were taking any steps to trace the source of supply of such bullets if they had been used in the campaign as stated.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The so-called Dum-dum bullets, which are not explosive bullets, have been used against the troops in the recent frontier campaigns, and are probably part of a large quantity of ammunition captured from a convoy by the Afridis at the advance on Maidan.

The use of these bullets is not opposed to any international law or to the customs of war.

Mr. DILLON: Would the right hon. gentleman say whether these bullets were supplied to the British troops to be used against these tribes?

Lord G. HAMILTON: Yes, certainly. The Dum-dum bullets were part of the equipment of the troops.

Mr. DILLON: It is most barbarous. (Nationalist cheers.)

Lord G. HAMILTON: The hon. gentleman assumes that they are explosive bullets.

Mr. DILLON: No, I know perfectly well what they are. They are bullets——

The SPEAKER: Order, order.

Lord G. HAMILTON: They are not explosive bullets, and, as I stated before, they are not opposed to international law or the customs of war. (Hear.)

Mr. DILLON: They are most barbarous. (Nationalist cheers.)

THE ARMY ESTIMATES.

Sir CHARLES DILKE asked the First Lord of the Treasury, if the Government would consider the expediency of showing in a note to the Army Estimates the British disciplined forces which were under the Foreign and Colonial Offices, such as, for example, the forces now serving in Uganda and the new African frontier force:

And, what steps had been taken with regard to the latter to avoid the evils of divided high command, such as those which were alleged to exist before the Punjab frontier force was placed under the Commander-in-Chief in India.

Mr. BALFOUR: As the right hon. baronet is aware, the Army Estimates are confined to British establishments at home and abroad, and they are hardly, therefore, the place in which to include any statement in regard to Indian and Colonial forces. If any such statement is required, it should take the form of a return, which might be presented to Parliament every year.

Sir C. DILKE: Looking to the fact that the Indian native troops used to be shown in a note to the Army Estimates, will the right hon. gentleman consider whether that form may not be taken of showing the number of troops under the Colonial and Foreign Offices?

Mr. BALFOUR: I was not aware of the fact to which the right hon. baronet calls attention, but I will consult the authorities at the War Office and see what their views on the subject are.

Friday, February 25.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

"BARBAROUS" BULLETS.

Lord STANLEY OF ALDERLEY asked her Majesty's Government whether they would lay on the Table any surgical reports on the wounds of Piper Findlater and others caused by Dum-dum bullets, so that the country might judge whether the bullets were not contrary to the spirit of the Convention against explosive bullets; and whether her Majesty's Government sanctioned the issue of Dum-dum bullets for military purposes.

The EARL OF ONSLOW: We have had no reports on the wounds of Private Findlater and others caused by Dum-dum bullets. Those bullets are not explosive at all, and their use is not contrary to the spirit of any convention or custom of war. No special sanction has been given by her Majesty's Government for the use of those bullets, as none was asked for or required.

THE PLAGUE IN BOMBAY.

Lord REAY asked the Under-Secretary of State for India what was the extent of the increase of the plague in Bombay city this year over the corresponding period of last year; whether it had diminished in the rest of the Presidency, and, if so, to what extent; what steps had been taken to prevent its spread to other parts of India, and how far had they been successful; whether in the conduct of plague operations greater success had been attained than last year in the detection of cases of death from the plague, and whether the co-operation of the people in these operations had been secured; whether the hospital accommodation and staff of nurses and doctors was adequate to the requirements, and to what extent preventive inoculation had been made use of, and how far the Native population had availed themselves of it.

The EARL OF ONSLOW: In Bombay city the plague and plague deaths were rapidly growing worse from December 1 last until the week ending February 11, the present month. The number of reported plague deaths in Bombay city were, for instance, for the three weeks ending January 28, February 4, and February 11, 840, 1,004, and 1,220 respectively. The corresponding figures for last year were, on the other hand, 402, 607, and 803 only. The last telegram received from India contains fortunately better news. The deaths for the week ending February 18 have fallen to 1,136, or 84 less than in the previous week. This is the first time for ten weeks that our weekly telegram has not shown a progressive increase in the reported plague deaths in Bombay city. For the corresponding week in 1897 the figure was 849, as compared with the 1,136 mentioned. But it must be pointed out that the Government of Bombay believe the plague deaths to be more strictly and more completely reported now than they were last year. Also they estimate the present population of the city at 800,000 persons, as compared with about 450,000 last year, owing to panic and the exodus. Immense efforts are being made in a systematic way to combat the plague and prevent its spreading in the city, and experience of successful plague campaigns elsewhere is being utilised. The Government, its officers, and the Governor himself are not sparing themselves. The hospitals are well organised, the supply of doctors and nurses is sufficient, reinforcements being sent from home, at two or three days' notice, whenever asked for. Ten more doctors went this week. In all 59 men and women doctors and 61 nurses have been sent. It is with deep regret that I have to inform your lordships that two of the lady nurses, Miss Morgan and Miss Macdougall, have died of plague during the performance of their duties. The Plague Committee has recently been strengthened, and the superior skilled staff is nearly double of that employed last year. In addition, part of the detective staff are employed in research work. As an instance of the manner in which the Bombay Plague Committee carries out its work, I may mention that recently 16,600 houses were inspected during a single week, with the result that 600 plague cases were discovered. Camp accommodation was also ready for 8,800 persons, and was in course of construction for 15,000 persons, so that accommodation for 23,800 persons either has now been, or will be, provided. Twenty-nine hospitals were also open, containing 1,011 case. For purposes of organisation Bombay city has been divided into wards, which are subdivided into districts and subdivisions of districts, and these again into smaller areas. Persons who have been in contact with the sick are carefully segregated. About 7½ per cent. of such persons are found to be infected. The people themselves are—to some extent—co-operating, and it may be hoped that the epidemic will yield to continued, persistent, and well-directed effort. In the Bombay presidency outside Bombay the situation is very different. In Karachi city, where the plague was most severe and fatal last year, and in the province of Sind generally, there has been no plague this year except six cases in Upper Sind; there has not been a single plague death in Karachi for 4½ months. Over the whole of the Bombay presidency (including native States) outside Bombay city plague deaths ranged from 1,800 to 2,000 deaths per week during November, 1897; during the past four weeks the total plague deaths in the same territory have been 945, 868, 866, and 747 during the week ended February 18. In individual towns the decrease has been much more marked; thus Poona city averaged 431 plague deaths a week during November, while during the past two weeks the Poona plague deaths have been 37 and 21. In Satara district plague deaths ranged from 696 to 1,003 a week during November; during the past two weeks Satara plague deaths have been 110 and 84. In Sholapur, Palanpur, Kutch, and almost every town and district except Baroda there has been a gradual or a rapid diminution of plague deaths during the past two months. We may say that within the presidency of Bombay outside Bombay city, and even in Bombay city to some extent, as already explained, the plague has almost everywhere diminished; the measures taken against plague have improved and extended; while on the whole the people have come or are coming to acquiesce in or even sometimes to co-operate in anti-plague work. It is only in new places where plague operations first begin that opposition occurs, and only in a very few cases has any act of overt opposition been recorded. Constant precautions and inspections are taken through the agency of men and women doctors, and other trustworthy officials on the railways and at seaports to prevent plague from being carried to other parts of India. So far these measures have succeeded in preventing the spread of the epidemic, which has now raged for 18 months in the western presidency. The latest weekly reports for India, outside the Presidency of Bombay, show a very few cases in Rajputana on the confines of Bombay territory, and a very few imported or sporadic cases in the Saharanpur district of the North-West Provinces, near to Hardwar. Plague is also prevalent in epidemic form in some ten villages on the borders of the Jullundur and Hoshiapur districts of the Punjab. In these villages plague has been present for six months; but the restrictive measures taken have so far succeeded in preventing its spreading beyond this small area. In the Nizam's territory of Hyderabad a larger number of cases is reported, but measures are being taken to cope with the outbreak efficiently. No plague is reported from other parts of India. The anti-plague measures no doubt cause inconvenience and annoyance to the people as they would do to us if, unhappily, they had to be taken in the United Kingdom. But every effort by constant care and inspection is made to prevent all avoidable trouble and annoyance to the people. Where causeless inconvenience occurs the remedy is applied promptly, and on the whole the people appear to admit the expediency of these measures and to recognise the goodwill of the Government in the matter. As to the steps taken to prevent the spread of the plague, I may mention that travellers by railway, steamer, and boat, from plague districts to other parts of India, are examined by medical men and women, disinfected, and, if necessary, retained in segregation camps before they are allowed to proceed to or disembark at their destination. Similarly, persons leaving infected cities and towns are examined before they are allowed to start, and are detained if their symptoms or previous surroundings give cause for apprehension that the travellers may carry plague to non-infected districts. As to preventive inoculation against plague, this has been largely employed after the system of Dr. Haffkine, and the Government of India consider that the result of his experiments made at Damaun is so encouraging that they are not without hope that protection may be proved to be possible by means of prophylactic inoculation. They think that every opportunity should be taken to test its efficacy, and local governments and administrations have been directed to procure a supply of serum, for the use of persons who desire to have themselves inoculated. Dr. Haffkine himself has recently been instructed to proceed to Baroda to carry out inoculation there. Information on this and other subjects will be laid before your lordships in a Blue-book, which is now passing through the press.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE COST OF THE WAR BEYOND THE FRONTIER.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would lay upon the Table the despatches, telegrams, and correspondence between the India Office and the Government of India on the subject of the expenses of the frontier war.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The official telegrams relating to this subject are few, and I read out their substance in the debate last Tuesday. I will readily publish them if the hon. member wishes it.

THE ARMY ESTIMATES.
THE GOVERNMENT'S PROPOSALS AND INDIA.

Mr. BRODRICK, in the course of his speech on the motion to go into Committee, said: The organization of our Army is unique. It is so because its duties are unique. Other nations organise themselves for home defence and for foreign invasion. Our Army, with a prodigious frontier to defend, has to provide a force for possible large wars, and at any moment to carry on minor wars in every variety of climate, from the torrid zone to the snows of the Himalayas. Beyond this, whether in peace or war, the conditions of our service are exceptional. No other nation maintains half its army abroad in

time of peace, mainly in tropical climates; no other nation attempts to defend its own frontiers without compulsory service, still less to protect colonies and dependencies covering more than 11,000,000 square miles; no other nation draws on its population for half the number of seamen and marines now enrolled by this country, and we, who are essentially a maritime nation, are thus forced to compete in the labour market with an advanced and highly popular service, and have hitherto done so at a rate of pay exactly similiar to that which the British man-at-arms received at the battle of Agincourt. (Laughter) . . . . our present force at home is too small in peace to maintain the force abroad, and that in the case of our minor wars we have either to send composite battalions, which is the worst form of battalion, or to withdraw strong battalions from foreign stations and replace them by weak and immature battalions. This is strikingly illustrated at this moment in the Mediterranean, where every single line battalion is either below its strength or contains an undue proportion of young soldiers. It is here that we fall short. It is for this that we come to Parliament for assistance. In regard to minor emergencies we shall meet the difficulty by offering to a number not exceeding 5,000 infantrymen in their first year of service in the Reserve a special payment—a shilling a day instead of sixpence which they now receive—to take part in them if called upon. We believe that this will meet the case. But we have still to face the permanent overstrain of our home battalions. Our force abroad has been continually increasing. In 1870 we had 90,700 men abroad and 89,600 men at home. In 1880 we had 97,000 men abroad and 91,800 at home. When we introduced the Estimates last year we had 117,700 abroad and 102,000 at home, the disparity having increased since 1870 by 14,600 men. Since February last year we have been subjected to an incessant strain. We have 20 battalions on the North-West frontier calling upon us for increased drafts; we have sent two additional battalions and three batteries to South Africa; we have had to furnish three more for active service up the Nile—and may have to send more; and we have sent one to Crete.

Sir Charles Dilke said in the course of his speech, the Government had come to the House with proposals which went a great deal further in the direction of the reforms than their proposals of last year. The question of how they ought to accept them and how the House ought to receive them, would depend upon what they elicited in debate as to what those proposals really were. No reason had been given for the adoption of the three years term. It was, no doubt, the term adopted in several foreign armies, but it was longer than that adopted in the German army, and, considering the greater military aptitude of our race, he should have thought a two years term would have been sufficient for experimental service. The present was a hybrid system which the War Office called short service and other people called long service adapted to meet the requirements of India, but against the wishes of the Indian Government. According to computations the additional cost of the proposed changes would be very large to India—£400,000 a year when they came fully into operation, and this at a time when the people of India could least afford the increase. (Hear, hear.) . . . The increase for home and India in the present estimate was £1,370,000, in addition to the war burdens which were to be thrown on India. The military expenditure, including that connected with the Colonial and Foreign Offices, would probably for the year exceed £43,000,000. This was vastly greater than the expenditure of any other Power in the world on the whole of its defence.

Tuesday, March 1.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS PRESENTED.

East India (Contagious Diseases).—Petitions against State regulation. From Plymouth, Leeds, Clapton, and Saffron Walden (two). To lie upon the Table.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE. DELAY OF THE REPORT.

Mr. Herbert Lewis asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware, that it was now seven months since the evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure was closed:

And, if there was any probability that the Commission would report before the Indian Budget was discussed by the House.

Lord G. Hamilton: I understand that it is the case that the oral evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure was closed in August last.

With regard to the second part of the question, I am unable to add anything to the answer I gave to the hon. member for the Eastern Division of North Hants on the 14th ultimo.

ALLEGED LACK OF CHAPLAINS BEYOND THE FRONTIER.

Mr. Samuel Smith asked the Secretary of State for India whether it was the case that few or no Army chaplains or ministers of religion accompanied the British troops during the operations on the frontier of India, and that there was no religious service on Sundays:

And, whether many men died and were buried without a minister of religion going near them.

Lord G. Hamilton: It is not the case that few or no ministers of religion accompanied the British troops on the recent operations in India. Fifteen chaplains were attached to the several field forces, and no doubt rendered the offices of religion to the troops whenever circumstances permitted of their doing so.

"BARBAROUS" BULLETS. EVASIVE REPLIES FROM THE INDIA OFFICE.

Mr. Dillon asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government had received any medical reports as to the effect of Dum-dum bullets on men or animals in the recent military engagements on the North-West frontier of India.

Mr. MacNeill asked the Secretary of State for India whether the specific quality of the Dum-dum bullets supplied to British troops to be used against the Afridis consisted in crushing and pulverising the bone so as to defy all surgical skill employed in setting:

In what respects were the Dum-dum bullets less calculated, than explosive bullets, to inflict incurable injury:

And, what was the authority for the statement that the Dum-dum bullets were consonant with internal law on the usages of civilised warfare.

Lord G. Hamilton: As questions No. 45 and No. 72 relate to the same subject, I may perhaps be allowed to answer them together.

According to the information supplied to me, the effects of this bullet are not more serious (indeed I believe they are less serious) than those of the old Snider bullet; nor than those of the Martini-Henri bullet. But on the other hand, as was clearly shown during the Chitral expedition, the Lee-Metford bullet frequently failed to attain the object with which all missiles are discharged in war, namely that of disabling the enemy with the least possible suffering. The Dum-dum bullet fulfils this purpose, as did the bullets previously used by the British army and fulfils it in the same way.

That the use of the Dum-dum bullet is consonant with international law, as set forth in the terms of the St. Petersburg Convention of 1868, is perfectly clear, inasmuch as what the Convention forbids is the use of any explosive projectile, below a certain weight, "charged with fulminating or inflamable matter."

I have received as yet no medical reports from India on the effects of the Dum-dum bullets in the recent engagements, but I have asked the Government of India to expedite this information.

Mr. MacNeill: As I expected, the noble lord promised what he has not performed. (Ministerial cries of "Order.") He said he would answer my question.

The Speaker: If the question has not been fully answered the hon. member can, without preface, ask for a fuller answer.

Mr. MacNeill: Very well. I wish to know whether the specific quality of the Dum-dum bullet supplied to British troops to be used against the Afridis consists in crushing and pulverising the bone so as to defy all surgical skill employed in setting. Secondly, in what respects are the Dum-dum bullets less calculated than explosive bullets to inflict incurable injury.

Lord G. Hamilton: There is no doubt that the so-called Dum-dum bullet inflicts a more serious wound than a bullet from the Lee-Metford rifle. But I believe any one can convert that bullet into a Dum-dum bullet by simply flattening its head.

Sir Howard Vincent: Has the noble lord any information as to whether Dum-dum bullets have been used by the Afridis against British troops?

Lord G. Hamilton: I have already answered that question. It is assumed that what ammunition they got they took from our transport or convoy.

LONG HOURS IN THE JUTE INDUSTRY.

Sir John Leng asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that in the jute manufacturing industry of India, which gave employment to nearly 100,000 persons, increasing complaints were made of the long hours, of working day and night under the electric light; and that the Jute Association of Calcutta were almost unanimously in favour of closing the mills early on Saturday and giving the European employees their Sunday rest, which was only prevented by the refusal of one or two employers.

And, whether he would recommend legislation by the Government of Bengal to carry out the views of the large majority of employers, as recommended by the special Inspector of Factories.

Lord G. Hamilton: (1.) My information on the subject is contained in the following extract of a letter from the Government of India, dated the 16th December last, which, with permission of the House, I will read:—"The Government of India say on the report (that is the Factory Inspector's report) for 1895, the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal expressed a hope that the members of the Jute Association and other employers would take into their serious consideration the question of closing mills early on Saturday for purposes of cleaning and repairs, so as to give the European employees their Sunday rest. The matter was discussed by the Jute Association, but not with beneficial effect, as although all but one of the mills were in favour of closing at 3 o'clock on Saturday, the agents in Dundee of that mill refuse to consent to the measure. Thus all the mills are kept working as before. The Government of Bengal intends to bring the matter to the notice of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce. We are awaiting the result of that reference before deciding what action should be taken in the matter."

(2) In these circumstances I do not propose to take any step until I hear further from India.

Thursday, March 3.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE POST OFFICE BILL.

Mr. MacNeill asked the Secretary of State for India whether it was by the advice and with the sanction of the Home Government that the Post Office Bill had been introduced into the Legislative Council of India:

Whether, under the provisions of that Bill, any postal officer could stop in transit, and ultimately destroy, any letter, newspaper, packet, parcel, etc., which he suspected to contain anything which in his opinion was defamatory or seditious:

And, on what grounds had this Bill been introduced.

Lord G. Hamilton: The Post Office Bill, which is a consolidating and amending Bill, was not submitted to me before its introduction, but in the ordinary course a copy was sent home shortly afterwards, and was received by me in November last.

So far as defamatory and seditious matter is concerned, the powers

referred to, can only be exercised in respect of postal articles which have on them, or on their covers, words, or marks of seditious, defamatory, or grossly offensive character. There is no power to act on suspicion in such cases.

The object of the Bill generally is to consolidate the laws relating to the Post Office, to supply omissions and defects in it, and to adapt it to modern requirements.

THE DETENTION OF THE NATU BROTHERS.

Mr. MacNeill asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the property of the Natus, both real and personal, which was of very considerable value, had been attached by the Government, and the only provision made for their support and maintenance had been an allowance of Rs. 250 per month in one case and Rs. 200 per month in the other:

Whether, under the provisions of the Regulation of 1827, under which the Natu brothers were arrested, the seizure of personal property was not authorised:

And, whether the Government will make any reparation to the brothers Natu for acting in excess of the powers conferred upon them by this regulation.

Mr. MacNeill also asked the Secretary for India, whether he was aware that repeated applications on the part of the brothers Natu, who were arrested at Poona on 20th July last, and had since been detained in gaol with no charge formulated against them, for liberty to be granted to their legal advisers to see them had been refused, and that the enquiries of these gentlemen as to the matter charged against them, and the evidence on which the proceedings against them were founded, had remained unanswered by the Government:

And, whether, having regard to the fact that the Natu brothers had now been in close imprisonment without having been charged with any offence or brought to trial for upwards of seven months, they would be either immediately brought to trial or discharged.

Lord George Hamilton: It will be convenient if I answer together the two sets of questions of which the hon. and learned member for South Donegal has given me notice.

The provision made for the elder Natu during his detention is Rs.300 a month, and for the younger Rs.200 a month. The whole revenue derived from their immovable property is applied to the maintenance of the several members of the Natu families.

The attachment of personal property is not authorised by the Regulation cited. Such movable property as was inadvertently attached by the local officers has been or is being restored, and no question of reparation has yet arisen.

The Natus have been informed of the reasons for their arrest in the terms of the Regulation, but access to their legal advisers has not been granted. I am aware that they have made one application on this subject which was answered; whether they have made more than one I do not know.

The detention of the Natus under personal restraint must continue until the Government of India and Bombay are satisfied that their release will not endanger the public tranquillity.

THE VICTORIA CROSS.

Mr. Brookfield asked the Secretary of State for India, whether it was the case that Native officers and soldiers of the Indian army were at present ineligible for the decoration of the Victoria Cross:

And, whether, in view of the many signal acts of valour and devotion for which these subjects of her Majesty had been distinguished since the Victoria Cross was first instituted, he would consider the expediency of advising the alteration in the present conditions of winning the Victoria Cross, so as to make all officers and soldiers in her Majesty's service eligible for this reward for distinguished bravery in the field.

Lord G. Hamilton: My honourable friend is perhaps unaware that the officers and soldiers of the Native army, who are ineligible for the Victoria Cross, have an order of their own, the "Order of Merit," for which they alone are eligible. This order is given as a reward for personal bravery. It consists of three classes, and carries with it additional pay: in the third class, one third; in the second class, two-thirds; in the first class, the equivalent of the recipient's net pay. In the lower ranks the additional pay is less than the £10 attached to the Victoria Cross, in the higher ranks it is more. This Order is highly valued by the Native army, and I see great objections to an alteration of the existing arrangement.

THE NEW ARMY SCHEME.

Mr. Samuel Smith asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the Government intended to throw upon India the increased charge caused by their proposal to raise the pay of the soldier in the British Army, and how much this would come to:

Whether the British soldier serving in India would receive this increased pay at an exchange of 1s. 4d. the rupee, thus giving him an advantage over the Native soldier, whose pay calculated in rupees was not affected by the rate of exchange:

Whether the British soldier on a shilling a day would in such case receive Rs. 23 per month, while the Native soldier received Rs. 8 a month and had to feed himself:

And, whether, under these circumstances, the Government would consent that this increased charge should be borne by this country.

Lord G. Hamilton: I am in communication with the Government of India on the subject of the increased charges which will be caused by the proposals of her Majesty's Government with regard to the pay of the British army. The question to be settled is very complicated, the grocery ration in India being on quite a different basis from that adopted in this country, and I am not yet in a position to say what the effects of the change will be. In any case, the cost of the British army in India will continue to be borne, as it has always been borne, by India.

ET CAETERA.

We are glad to be able to state that Mr. Robinson Souttar, M.P., is making satisfactory progress to recovery from the accident he recently sustained.

The Queen's dinner party at Windsor Castle on Wednesday night included Lord George Hamilton, M.P., and Lady George Hamilton, Lord Ronald Gower, and General Godfrey Clerk, C.B. Her Majesty's guests remained at the Palace.

Sir George Robertson, of Chitral fame, dined at the House of Commons on Monday evening with several members, amongst whom was Mr. Hanbury. Sir Lewis McIver was to have joined the party, but he telegraphed to say he had met with an accident and could not leave home.

Sir A. P. MacDonnell, Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces of India, will take six months' leave of absence from May next in accordance with a medical certificate.

During the absence of Sir A. P. MacDonnell on leave, Mr. J. J. J. D. La Touche, C.S.I., will act as Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces of India.

Sir Mortimer Durand, who has been in this country for the last four months on long leave, has arranged to leave England to-day by the Indian mail for Brindisi and join the P. and O. steamship "Arcadia" for Egypt, *en route* for Persia, to resume his duties as British Minister at Teheran.

The P. and O. s.s. "Caledonia" arrived at Marseilles from Bombay on February 19. The following were among her passengers: Mr. Abdulla and Mr. Tramjee (to Brindisi), Capt. T. M. Ward (to Marseilles), and Mr. A. N. Chandhuri (to London).

The P. and O. s.s. "Oriental," which left London for Bombay on March 3, had the following passengers among others: Mr. F. M. Kanga and Capt. T. E. Hogg. The P. and O. s.s. "Rome" leaves London on March 11 for Bombay. Her list of passengers includes the following: Major and Mrs. Wrench, Captain Arthur Duff, Mr. E. S. Kouslam, and Major J. W. Currie.

The question of Bimetallism as affecting India will be brought before the House of Commons on Tuesday, the 29th. Mr. Vicary Gibbs has obtained the first place on that day for a Motion with reference to the monetary standard in India, and its relation to the financial position of that country.

The Parliamentary Committee of the Bimetallic League met on Wednesday with Sir H. Houldsworth in the chair, and appointed a Sub-committee to draft a Resolution, to be placed on the Paper of the House, and to consider generally the course of Parliamentary action to be adopted. It was said to be probable that the Resolution would call for the appointment of a Commission to enquire into the results of the closing of the Indian Mints.

We regret to record the death, which occurred on Tuesday, of Colonel Malleson. His two works, the "History of the Indian Mutiny" (a continuation of Sir John Kaye's "Sepoy War") and the "French in India," are well known. He was also the author of biographies of distinguished Indian statesmen and various books on the Central Asian Question. In early life he rendered assistance to Lord Canning, and acted as guardian to the young Mahárájá of Mysore. Colonel Malleson, in addition to being an expert in Indian history and politics, had a reputation as an Alpinist and as a Tory politician. He was married in 1856 to the sister of the three "heroic Battyes."

A correspondent writes:—A "Tea and Tiffin Bungalow"—the latest novelty in London restaurants—was opened a few days ago at 170, New Bond Street, by Mme. Pheroze Langrana, an Indian lady well known to many Indians and Anglo-Indians. At a private view, which took the form of a luncheon, Indian and other ladies and gentlemen wished the proprietress success in her original undertaking. The company included among others, Major-General Sir Owen Tudor Berne, who presided; Lady Agnes Berne, Lord and Lady Hobhouse, and Sir George Bridwood. The "Bungalow" consists of a tastefully fitted saloon of truly Indian appearance. Specimens of Native workmanship abound, and the lady attendants, though English, heighten the general effect by appearing in Oriental costume.

No reason in the world (writes the *Investors' Review*) why we should help India provided India can pay her way. But she cannot, and all this talk about "surpluses," past and to come, is—Lord George must really bear with the expression—so much juggling with words. Most of the figures he was given by the Indian Government to reel off for the discomfiture of its critics were figures built upon the foundation of an artificial and unreal rate of exchange. How is it that the rupee is kept at 1s. 3d. or 1s. 4d. or any neighbouring figure? Simply by suspending in part the payment of the home charges for which the Indian Government is liable. Not two-thirds of these charges are provided for this financial year. Lay them in full any year on the trade of India, without counterpoise in the shape of large fresh loans raised here on Indian account, and the rupee could not long be kept from declining to 6d. or less. What is the use of gabbling about "surpluses," "growth," or "recovery" of revenue and so forth before a position like this?

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

JUST PUBLISHED.

With Portraits and a Map. 8vo. **16s.**

A MEMOIR of Major-General Sir HENRY C. RAWLINSON, Bart.,

K.C.B., F.R.S., D.C.L., F.R.G.S., &c.,

BY

GEORGE RAWLINSON,

M.A., F.R.G.S., Canon of Canterbury.

With a Preface by Field-Marshal Lord Roberts of Kandahar.

LONGMAN, GREEN & CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

In Crown 8vo, cloth, price **7s. 6d.**

THOMAS BEST JERVIS,

LIEUT.-COL. BOMBAY ENGINEERS, H.E.I.C.'s SERVICE, DIRECTOR OF THE TOPOGRAPHICAL AND STATISTICAL WAR DEPARTMENT.

A Biography by his Son, W. P. JERVIS.

"The biographer has done his work with judgment and discretion, and has produced a work of considerable general utility and interest." *Glasgow Herald.*

"A faithful autobiography. As being a centenary tribute by his son, there is much relating to the condition of India in former times, the better enabling us to judge of the progress manifested in that country of late years."—*Western Daily Mercury.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

"INDIA." Vol. VIII. (1897.)

NOW READY.

BOUND IN CLOTH (post free), **8/6**, *net cash.*

To be obtained at the Offices,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

A limited number of VOLUMES V. (1894), VI. (1895), *and* VII. (1896) *can be obtained at the same price. Remittances should accompany order.*

English Newspapers, Books, Magazines, &c.

WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS, Ltd.,

WHOLESALE AND EXPORT BOOKSELLERS, STATIONERS, AND NEWSVENDORS,

CANNON HOUSE, BREAM'S BUILDINGS, LONDON, ENGLAND.

(*Established* 1809.)

Orders for ENGLISH BOOKS, MAGAZINES, PERIODICALS, NEWSPAPERS, &c., punctually attended to, carefully packed, and despatched by first mails to Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, India, China, and throughout the world.

Remittance, or reference for payment in London, to accompany all orders. Advertisements and notices of Births, Marriages, and Deaths inserted in all the English Newspapers. Send for a Complete List of English and Foreign Newspapers, Magazines, &c. Also for Catalogue of Works and Text Books in the Oriental Languages.

6d. Weekly.]

THE "HOME NEWS"

Is the **BEST SUMMARY of EUROPEAN INTELLIGENCE.**

SPECIALLY PREPARED FOR
INDIA, CEYLON, CHINA, and AUSTRALASIA.
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY.

THE "HOME NEWS" Will keep readers posted up in all Political, Social, Literary, Dramatic, and other movements.

THE "HOME NEWS" Contains Original and Special Matter, and gives the cream of the European Newspapers.

Ask the Local Newsagent to get it, or send Subscription direct to the Publisher.

Subscription, including postage, payable in advance—

Period.	All places abroad.	In United Kingdom.
Three Months...	£0 7 7	£0 7 1
Six Months	0 15 9	0 14 1
One Year	1 10 4	1 8 2

CHEQUES AND P.O. ORDERS TO BE MADE TO THE ORDER OF GRINDLAY & CO.

OFFICES: 55, PARLIAMENT STREET, LONDON, S.W.

FIFTH EDITION. Extra Crown 8vo, **12s. 6d.**

A HISTORY OF THE INDIAN MUTINY,

and of the Disturbances which accompanied it among the Civil Population.

By T. RICE HOLMES.

Fifth Edition, Revised throughout and slightly enlarged.
WITH FIVE MAPS AND SIX PLANS.

St. James's Gazette:—"His work abounds in lessons that can never lose their value. . . . . Mr. Holmes's narrative is as interesting as it is instructive. . . . Mr. Holmes is splendidly impartial."

Athenæum:—"His work is in every sense of the word a history and deserves to be read."

MACMILLAN & CO., LTD., LONDON.

NOW READY.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 1.

THE SKELETON AT THE (JUBILEE) FEAST.

BY SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

(Being a series of Suggestions towards the prevention of Famine in India. Reprinted from "India.")

Obtainable from the
BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

Price Sixpence, or Six Annas, net.

"Louene"

A Simple, Safe, & Reliable NERVE SEDATIVE.

GUARANTEED PURELY VEGETABLE AND NEITHER OPIATE NOR NARCOTIC IN ITS ACTION.

For NEURALGIA, NERVOUS HEADACHE, FACEACHE, SLEEPLESSNESS, and other Nervous Troubles.

The EARL OF MOUNT-CASHELL writes: "Acted like magic, and relieved pain almost immediately."

The COUNTESS OF BANTRY writes: "A good remedy for sleeplessness."

PRICES, 2/9 and 4/6 per bottle. Post free in the United Kingdom, 3/- and 4/9. Foreign postage extra.

Pamphlet, containing many valuable Medical and other Testimonials, post free on application to

THE LOUENE CO., 43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.